The Outlook

JUNE 7, 1913

LYMAN ABBOTT, Editor-in-Chief HAMILTON W. MABIE, Associate Editor
THEODORE ROOSEVELT
Contributing Editor

The Lobby and the Tariff

The Underwood Tariff Bill is evidently to meet its critical stage when the sugar and wool provisions are before the Senate for action. President Wilson's plain-spoken assertions as to a tariff lobby are interpreted as a direct appeal to the country for popular support against attacks by the large industries involved. The President, without any imputation of corrupt practices, declares that Washington has seldom seen "so numerous, so industrious, and so insidious a lobby," and that the "newspapers are being filled with paid advertisements calculated to mislead not only the judgment of public men, but also the public opinion of the country itself." To this assertion he adds: "There is every evidence that money without limit is being spent to sustain this lobby and to create an appearance of a pressure of public opinion antagonistic to some of the chief items of the tariff bill." No doubt the country will agree that the tariff bill should be settled in broad daylight and not by secret conferences. There ought to be such a debate in the Senate on the big issues involved as would be read and quoted for twenty years as the most intellectual existent presentation of arguments on both sides. Incidentally one may hope to learn just how the Democratic leaders have determined that the particular lowering, raising, or abolishing of duties will in fact produce the effect desired—the general reduction of tariff in such a way as to benefit the consumer, encourage competition at home, enlarge our foreign trade, and promote American prosperity. The aid of a Tariff Commission has not been had or wished for, and any wide system of inquiry into statistics and commercial conditions has not preceded legislation. Yet this rejected method of inquiry by a judicial, non-partisan authority is exactly what is threatened when Secretary Redfield and Mr. Underwood propose to have a bureau of the Department of Commerce investigate any attempts at reducing wages under pretext of loss through tariff changes. If inquiry into cost, wages, and profits here and abroad (which is in exact words what Mr. Underwood says the bureau may and will do) is just and desirable in the smaller matter and after the passage of a bill resting upon leaders' wisdom and caucus inspiration, why is it not valuable in the larger matter of finding out by Tariff Board inquiry in advance and in a scientific way what tariff changes would mean?

The Keys to Alaska's Wealth

That an adequate railway system to develop Alaska's resources is a prime necessity, and that, since a large part of Alaska's valuable coal land belongs to the Nation, the National Government should control or own the railways which must be built to open up its own property, has been urged more than once in The Outlook. In this sense the railways, as we have before said, are the keys to Alaska's wealth—and keys that should be held by the Government. This view has just been emphasized by a letter relating to legislation now pending in Congress, sent by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Franklin Lane, to Senator Pittman, the Chairman of the Senate's Committee on Territories. The bills under discussion provide for the construction by the National Government of a railway system in Alaska. Secretary Lane believes that policy right and necessary for the safe and quick development of Alaska. Indeed, he regards this as the only way; and he points out that England in Africa, Russia in western Asia, and the plans for the development of China, all center upon the railways. Mr. Lane definitely favors the policy of governmental ownership of Alaskan railways; he thinks of Alaska's future not as that of a land of mines and fisheries, but of towns, farms, mills, and factories, with millions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of strong and energetic people; and he sees that the first step toward that development is for the United States to build and own the railways which will connect the fertile valleys of the interior with the coast, and bring to the world's market Alaska's coal and mineral resources. In reply to the objection that Government ownership and construction is experimental, Mr. Lane says:

> This is a new policy for the United States. Very true. This is a new part of the United States. And policies properly change with new conditions. The one determining question in all matters of government should be, What is the wise thing to do? The ancient method of opening a country was to build wagon roads. The modern method is to build railways. To build these railways ourselves and control them may be an experiment, but such a plan does not suggest scandals more shameful or political conditions more unhealthy than many we have known in new portions of our country under private ownership. And in the end we will be free to establish and maintain our own chosen relationship between Alaska and the rest of the United States unhampered by threats of confiscation or the restraining hand of any merely selfish influences. We can only secure the highest and fullest use of Alaska by making her railways wholly subordinate to her industrial and social life and needs—true public utilities.

Defense that Does Not Defend

A military problem of importance is reported to be under consideration by the Secretary of War and his expert military advisers. This is the desirability of enlarging and changing our present system of coast defenses so as to provide against effective attack from the rear. An article which has appeared in the "Army and Navy Journal" urges the necessity of looking to the rear as well as to the front, and presents facts that sustain the new proposals; for instance, it is pointed out that the Massachusetts military maneuvers of 1909 gave a complete object-lesson of the fact that the great mass of coast fortifications that guards Boston was helpless to prevent the capture of the city by attacking troops landed at New Bedford and advancing by land upon Boston. This is largely true of other fortified places. What seems to be called for is, first, mobile forces of troops to guard the rear, and, secondly, the construction of batteries in existing fortifications so placed as to permit of all-around fire and planned to repel landward attacks. The argument certainly seems reasonable; any large plan of National defense should include the co-operation of mobile armies with coast fortifications. It has been proposed that the militia should be employed to furnish such a mobile force. But it seems probable that the regular army would have to be used in part in this fashion. The assertion is that all systems of coast defense which look to security through fortifications alone are destined to be of little use in time of real war. If our present coast defense is weak theoretically, the question cannot too soon be taken up for action by Congress and the War Department.

Progressive Legislation in California

The record of the California Legislature, which recently closed its sessions, merits attention, particularly because the Legislature and Governor of California have been Progressive in party politics. Hence the record of this year's legislation has been awaited with interest by many outside as well as inside of the State. The fortieth California Legislature adjourned with a practically unbroken record of success in carrying out the policies outlined some time since by Governor Johnson. Of course the most discussed bill was that with regard to the holding of lands by aliens. But this can hardly be listed as a Progressive party measure. While it had its inception in the majority side of the Legislature, all parties were united in their desire for a law to restrict the tenure of agricultural property by the Japanese. The so-called administrative programme may be summarized briefly as follows:

1. A Workmen's Compensation Act.
2. A Minimum Wage Act.
3. A Mothers' Pension Act.
4. A Rural Credits Commission Act.
5. A Civil Service Commission Act.
6. A State Water Commission Act.
7. A Corporation Commission Act.
8. A Primary Election Act.
9. A "Blue Sky" Act.
10. A Weights and Measures Act.

These ten measures have been facetiously termed the "Ten Commandments." But they are all measures in which any progressive administration might take pride.

A Poll of Women on the Suffrage

It is easy to get opinions about woman suffrage; it is hard to get facts. It is hard, for instance, to ascertain the proportion of women who really wish to vote. Do the majority of women want the ballot? Opinions on that differ; but on this subject an opinion is of little worth compared to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fact. The New York "Evening Sun" has tried in a limited field to get some light on that fact by making a poll of women in various sections of New York. The result, though of course not decisive, is interesting and significant. In the course of the canvass thirteen sections, representing the widest differences in social surroundings, were visited. In addition a poll was taken among four classes of women—school-teachers, factory employees, stenographers and bookkeepers, and saleswomen. The poll was taken at random. Two thousand answers were received. Of these 571 were in favor of suffrage, 651 against, and 778 indifferent. This means that 28½ per cent was in favor of suffrage, 32½ per cent against it, and 39 per cent indifferent; or, to state it otherwise, more than a third were indifferent to woman suffrage, almost a third were against it, and considerably less than a third were in favor of it. In only three out of the thirteen sections those who favored suffrage outnumbered those who were indifferent to it as well as those who were against it. On the other hand, there were only three districts in which those who were actively opposed to woman suffrage outnumbered those who were indifferent as well as those who were in favor of it. In seven districts those who were indifferent were in the plurality. It is interesting to note, first, that in those quarters in which life is more comfortable and the surroundings more commodious there was less proportionate vote for woman suffrage than in the more crowded quarters. In the lower East Side tenement district and in the Brooklyn tenement district there was the least indifference to the question, though in the one case the pro-suffrage outnumbered the anti-suffrage forty to seventy, while in the latter case the anti-suffrage outnumbered the pro-suffrage twenty-seven to fifteen. In the Williamsburg district, which was carried by a clear majority for suffrage, there was but one anti-suffrage vote, but the indifferent vote was two-thirds of the suffrage vote. Among the school-teachers the vote for outnumbered the vote against, but this was in turn outnumbered by the indifferent. Among the saleswomen the vote against outnumbered the vote for, four to one, but was again in turn outnumbered by the indifferent vote. Among the stenographers and bookkeepers and among the factory employees the pro-suffragists were in the plurality but not in a majority, being greatly outnumbered by the total of those who were either indifferent to or against the suffrage.

Some Opinions

The remarks of the women interviewed in the course of this poll on woman suffrage were interesting. They range from hearty expressions of approval to vigorous expressions of dissent. Expressions such as the following seem typical:

I voted for six years in Colorado and could not see that it made much difference, though I shall be ready for the vote when it comes.

Women ought to get all they can, but I have no time to vote myself.

If they want to vote, let them, but I don't care one way or the other.

I wouldn't mind having the vote, but I certainly will not go out and parade for it.

Though I might vote if I could, I feel that I have enough trouble without trying to run the politics of the country.

The strong expressions of opinion in favor of suffrage seemed to be few. Among them are the following:

I am in favor of the movement, but not a suffragette.

I believe that women owning property and workingwomen in general should vote.

Should women have the right to vote? Yes; why shouldn't they?

It might help to make things easier for us.

If anything is coming to us, we want it.

We couldn't make a worse mess of it than the men, and we might do better.

The opposition was expressed in the strongest terms of all:

I am utterly disgusted with the tactics of those promoting the movement.

I have enough rights now and would not vote if I could.

I am suffering enough now and am really too busy to bother with the suffrage movement at all.

No time for that; I have plenty of other work.

It is not a woman's business to do a man out of a job. Her place is at home.

I am afraid to say what I think of the suffrage movement. My opposition is so decided.

To these opinions of women on women's rights we add but one more—our own on men's rights. That is a matter which in the discussion of woman suffrage seems to be generally ignored. Where woman suffrage does not now exist it can be adopted only by the vote of men. The men have a right to learn what the women wish. If the men were allowed to speak, they might well say, "We may decide to give the women the vote only in case they want it; or we may decide to impose upon women the vote whether they want it or not; but we—the men—have a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

right to know whether the women want it or not, so that we may know which of these two things we are asked to do." What the New York "Evening Sun" has tried to ascertain informally by means of a "straw vote" ought to be ascertained officially by the secret and formal vote of women wherever the voters are called upon to pass on the question of woman suffrage.

Roosevelt vs. Newett

The case of Roosevelt vs. Newett will go down to history as one of the celebrated cases in American National life: not for any difficult question of fact raised, not for any difficult problem of law involved, but because it puts before the American people in a very definite form the question whether they will continue to condone, if not justify, the use of personal abuse as a legitimate kind of ammunition in a political campaign. Mr. Newett, the editor and proprietor of the Ishpeming "Iron Ore," said editorially last fall: "Roosevelt lies and curses in a most disgusting way. He gets drunk too, and that not infrequently, and all his intimates know about it." Mr. Roosevelt, who was resolved that his name should not go down to history with this falsehood attached to it, immediately brought suit. The case is on trial at Marquette, Michigan, as The Outlook is going to press. Mr. Roosevelt was the first witness to go upon the stand. He entered under oath an explicit and sweeping denial of the charge, and gave a full and frank account of his life and habits. Witness after witness, out of an intimate acquaintance with Mr. Roosevelt, confirmed his testimony. We agree, and all of Mr. Roosevelt's associates and intimates will agree, with the statement of one of the most implacable of Mr. Roosevelt's political opponents, the New York "Sun:" "It is unnecessary to await the jury's verdict. Colonel Roosevelt squelched a lot of liars yesterday and, in vindicating himself, put an end to an annoyance that has frequently irritated us." And those who have no intimate acquaintance with him, if they have any knowledge concerning the effect of alcohol, would hardly need the sworn testimony of Dr. Lambert, his attending physician after the bullet wound received at Milwaukee: "He would not have recovered had he been a constant user of alcoholic liquor. To his splendid physique, unpoisoned by alcohol, he owes recovery from the wound." We think also the country will generally share in the judgment of the New York "Times," also a vigorous political opponent of Mr. Roosevelt: "Mr. Roosevelt has acted both courageously and wisely. There is more than the question at issue involved. The aspersion of the private character of public men, the attribution to them of evil habits, is too common."

An Intra-Balkan War?

Ever since the Balkan War began, the Turks have been saying that it was but the prelude to another war—a war in the Balkan States. The events of last week give color to that prophecy. In the first place, there was the tension between Bulgaria and Greece. As is well known, the Greeks captured Salonika, the most important port on the Ægean Sea. But the Bulgarians want an outlet on that sea. The terms of peace assure them a port farther east. But as Bulgaria's appetite for a money compensation on account of losses incurred in the war has increased her land hunger has also increased. It was supposed at first that she would be satisfied with a doubling of her territory. But no. If her soldiers have not been able to advance to Constantinople, or have been restrained by the Powers from so doing, she seems now in the mood to demand as recompense the second city in European Turkey—Salonika. She already has the third—Adrianople. The Greeks are naturally sensitive in view of the Bulgarian attitude. That part of the Bulgarian army encamped near Salonika has, the Greeks claim, been guilty of a number of attacks on the Greek forces, resulting in more or less bloodshed: the Greek generals declare that the Bulgarians are systematically creating incidents which cannot result otherwise than in such bloodshed. But the Bulgarians also have designs on the fourth city in European Turkey, Monastir, in Macedonia. The capture of Monastir was perhaps the most brilliant feature of the Servian campaign. The Servians point to the treaty of March, 1912, in accordance with which the territory to be conquered from Turkey was to be divided. At that time the formation of an independent Albania was not expected. Hence it was assumed that Montenegro and Servia would secure North Albania, that Greece would take South Albania, that Servia would occupy most of Macedonia, and Bulgaria most of Thrace.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Will the Balkan Alliance Last?

Bulgaria has obtained all that this treaty allowed her and more too. Not so Greece and Servia, especially Servia. For now that Servia is barred from Albania she naturally seeks compensation elsewhere, and is indignant at the thought that, should the Bulgarians acquire the Monastir country, nearly all the Macedonian territory won from Turkey by Servia would become Bulgarian. What is worst of all, the Servian access to the sea would be checked. Servia adds that, if the Bulgarians have their way, they would receive three-fifths of the territory won from the Turks; the other two-fifths being divided among Greece, Servia, and Montenegro. This proportion should be changed, Servia says, into not over three-tenths and a half to Bulgaria, two-tenths and a half each to Greece and Servia, and one-tenth and a half to Montenegro. To this the Bulgarians reply that the Servians do not consider one feature of the situation—the fact that Bulgaria has mobilized three times as many troops as were engaged in actual battle, whereas the Servians have mobilized only twice as many. Just at this point the voice of a European Power—Russia—makes itself heard. It reminds both Bulgaria and Servia that, according to Article IV of the treaty of 1912, all differences between the two states should be submitted to the arbitration of Russia. The possible break-up of the Balkan league is the peril in the present situation. To the world at large, the possession of more or less territory in the Balkan Peninsula by either Bulgaria or Servia may not matter much, no matter how much it matters to either one of these two states. But should the Balkan alliance break up, it would be a serious matter, not only to each of the four allies, but also to civilization in general.

The Death of Lord Avebury

One fact universally commented upon in recording the death of Lord Avebury last week, that he was better known to the world at large as Sir John Lubbock, is an indication that he will best be remembered as a popular writer on natural history and cognate subjects. Most Americans, at least, will instantly connect the name of Sir John Lubbock with his book on "Ants, Bees, and Wasps," which was perhaps more widely read in all English-speaking countries than any non-technical book of the kind, and which was in a sense the forerunner of Maeterlinck's book on the bees. In this volume, as with Maeterlinck and Fabre later, the author in a most engaging and fascinating way introduced his readers to the domestic affairs, community life, and even, it might be said, the international operations of the intensely interesting little creatures about which he wrote. Other readable books about animal and plant life followed, and Sir John also made his mark as a purely scientific writer as well as a delightful essayist about popular science. He cannot, of course, be ranked for serious achievements with Darwin; nor was he in the front rank of original investigators in the most modern sense; but his work was of immense value in bringing the general reader into touch with natural history and because it inspired further reading and study. Lord Avebury was a man of really remarkable versatility. He knew astronomy and the higher mathematics as well as natural history; he was a banker; became an authority on financial and industrial subjects; and as a member of Parliament (at one time, by the way, he was opposed in an election to Frederic Harrison, another man of scientific and literary attainments) he was influential in passing many important measures relating to financial, educational, and industrial questions. Sir John Lubbock was created a peer under the title of Lord Avebury in 1900.

Wits versus Convictions

In the first chapter of his Autobiography Mr. Roosevelt criticised, very directly, the almost universal custom of making intercollegiate debating a contest of wits rather than convictions. He said in part:

> Personally I have not the slightest sympathy with debating contests in which each side is arbitrarily assigned a given proposition and told to maintain it without the least reference to whether those maintaining it believe in it or not. The present method of carrying on debates encourages precisely the wrong attitude among those who take part in them. There is no effort to instill sincerity and intensity of conviction. On the contrary, the net result is to make the contestants feel that their convictions have nothing to do with their arguments. I am exceedingly glad that I did not take part in the type of debate in which stress is laid, not upon getting a speaker to think rightly, but on getting him to talk glibly on the side to which he is assigned, without regard either to what his convictions are or to what they ought to be.

This statement has aroused no little discussion in academic circles. The Harvard Alumni

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Bulletin" somewhat naïvely inquires: "Is there something in Colonel Roosevelt's contention?" That there certainly is a letter published in that journal goes far to show. Mr. Hans von Kaltenborn writes of his own experience as a debater:

"In my own case," he says, "after thinking, talking, and believing that Federal incorporation is about the most unsatisfactory solution of the trust problem, I was sent to Princeton to argue for Federal incorporation. The insincerity and artificiality of my speech was as apparent to the judges as it was to myself, and we lost the debate largely because my speech failed to carry conviction. Moreover, I have never ceased feeling thoroughly ashamed for having yielded to the persuasion of the debate managers. Throughout the trials, which extended over a period of several weeks, and in the course of which I spoke as I believed, points and illustrations suggested themselves spontaneously. In reading, my mind grasped quickly and eagerly everything that bore on my contentions. Having made the team . . . for three weeks—the most arduous and unpleasant weeks of my college career—I struggled to change my belief and to armor myself against it with an increasing array of 'proof.' Again and again the kindly coach, who was giving up his time to a hopeless cause, shook his head and suggested that I was not doing as well as at the trials. I knew it and couldn't help it. When the day came I went into the debate without joy or confidence. I came out feeling bitter and sick at heart over having brought defeat to my college without the consoling reflection that I had done my best."

Mr. von Kaltenborn concludes this heartfelt protest with the following expression of his opinion: "Informal discussions are almost the only kind encountered in real life. One give-and-take session with men who believe what they say and are permitted to say what they believe is better training than a dozen formal debates."

Save the Seaman

On Wednesday afternoon of last week in New York City the rain came down with pelting force. But that did not prevent a great crowd of well-wishers from going to the opening of the new building of the Seamen's Church Institute. It stands on the corner of Coenties Slip and South Street—the street bordering East River. It is within three short blocks of South Ferry, at the southern point of Manhattan Island, and is, we believe, the most remarkable building for seamen in the world. Its rather severe architecture is relieved in the upper and lower stories by effective decoration. But the building's most striking feature is the lighthouse tower, with its time-ball at the corner. The tower is a memorial to the heroes of the Titanic. As one entered the main floor from Coenties Slip last week past the boys who were busy checking the necessary umbrellas and raincoats, one was confronted by the lunch counter, soda fountain, hotel desk, post-office, hotel lobby, and sitting-room. Underneath are dining-rooms and a kitchen, a free shipping bureau, and a savings department. In the basement are a store for seamen, a baggage department, and a disinfecting plant, while in the cellar there is an auxiliary baggage-room, a refrigerating plant, the engine and boiler-room and dynamos. Above the main floor there are a public reading-room for seamen who do not live in the building and another reading-room for those who do; the floor also contains the superintendent's office, the administration rooms, and a chapel. The third floor comprises game-rooms; one counts eight billiard tables, a shuffleboard, and tables for checkers and chess. The fourth floor is occupied by the auditorium and class-rooms. The fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth floors are given up to very many comfortable little bedrooms. After seeing them one realizes that at last in New York City and close to the water's edge seamen may find not only clean beds, good food, wholesome amusements, and the influence of a home, but all these things assured by adequate and unexcelled equipment. No more necessary or inspiring charity exists than this. "A sailor's will is the wind's will," men say. But the mere sight of this splendid new building ought to stiffen any sailor's backbone.

How to Handle Immigrants

One of the most important aspects of the immigrant question is the problem of taking care of the immigrant after he reaches this country. Prominent among agencies whose function is the solution of this problem is the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society of New York City. Its President is Judge Leon Sanders; unlike some other presidents of societies, he gives his daily attention to this work. The Society does not seek to induce immigration. In the centers of Jewish emigration—that is to say, in Russia, Rumania, and the Austrian province of Galicia—it publishes literature informing the people there who intend to emigrate about our immigration laws and about the industrial,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agricultural, and commercial conditions here, but also urging them to prevent undesirable persons from emigrating. The Society gives guidance but no money. The immigrant once here, the work of distribution begins; that is to say, guiding the immigrant to his proper destination, and, if necessary, finding work for him. During the year 1912 the Society's guides directed nearly fifteen thousand men, women, and children to their destinations, and sent the immigration records of over eighteen thousand others to its agents in more than a hundred and fifty cities in forty-five States. Guides conduct those whose destination is New York City to the homes of their relatives or friends there; if the address is not correct, the immigrant is brought to the Society's House of Shelter. Immigrants going into the interior of the country are conducted aboard their trains or boats; their baggage is attended to, and their relatives telegraphed to meet them on reaching their destination. Those who cannot proceed as soon as they arrive are taken to the House of Shelter. An Employment Bureau helps all immigrants to become self-sustaining by providing them with employment. A Department of Education conducts lectures, maintains a library and reading-room, and distributes notices among the new arrivals directing them to the schools for immigrants maintained by the New York City Board of Education and by various societies. The immigrant who desires to become naturalized is invited to attend the meetings held every week to give necessary information; since this feature was inaugurated five years ago the Society has helped more than thirty-five thousand immigrants in New York City alone to secure their first papers or certificates of arrival.

Bishop Brent on American Responsibility in the Philippines

America is in control of the Philippines. Upon her wisdom or unwisdom hangs the fate of nine million Filipinos. If we had not assumed this responsibility from unselfish motives, another nation would have seized it from motives of self-interest, declares the Rt. Rev. Charles Henry Brent, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of the Philippines, "and at this date Liberty would sit mourning without the gates of the Philippines instead of reigning throughout her borders." We quote from an article by Bishop Brent in the New York "Tribune." The article contains some impressive statements concerning American responsibility in the Philippines. That responsibility is, of course, to further the progress of self-government to the utmost of our ability and the Filipinos' capacity. Moreover, we must execute our responsibility of control as a trust to be administered quite as much with as for the Filipino. "We are to train him by co-operative methods in the principles of self-government until he has attained it, and then, if he so elects, surrender to him the rights which belong to a full-grown nation." It is here, however, as the Bishop says, that we arrive at the parting of the ways. In his estimation, the dispute is not one of imperialism and anti-imperialism: "It fogs the issue to employ such terms." The question, he says, resolves itself into one of good judgment. "The opposing camps differ only in the matter of time. There are those who say now; others who say to-morrow; still others who say day after to-morrow." But the Filipino's degree of capacity will not be revealed until the school-boys of to-day are in active public life. The Bishop justly declares that the problem cannot be settled without reference to its international bearing. As to the proposal of neutralization: "Can American or any other dependency really secure the neutrality of the Powers?" asks Dr. Brent, and adds: "Would it mean anything if promises of neutrality were made?" In any case, "Can America afford to protect a Government half-way around the world which she does not actually and constructively control?" Based on his eleven years' experience, Bishop Brent's conviction of our present duty is that we are not in the Philippines for our share of profit: "If we were, it would be the most natural thing in the world to say that the game is not worth the candle." We are in the Philippines because we are required there. "If our rule were removed, the Philippines would at once become a prey to the strongest of the sectional aggregations, and they in turn would ultimately be devoured by intruders from outside." Hence, "as we do not know how to leave the Philippines, let us see if we know how to govern them."

In Memory of Edward Everett Hale

It is eminently fitting that the statue of Edward Everett Hale, by Bela Pratt, unveiled in Boston on May 22, should stand in the Public Gardens, where it will perpetuate the man described in one of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the addresses as "the incarnation of the spirit of Boston during the nineteenth century." The ceremony took place in connection with the meeting of the American Unitarian Association, with which Dr. Hale was so long connected, but it was in no sense denominational, and Dr. Hale's influence and value beyond as well as within the church and beyond as well as within Boston was most adequately recognized. Thus the Hon. John D. Long, after speaking of Dr. Hale as Boston's most conspicuous type of liberal theology, literature, culture, and humanitarianism, said: "Social worker, preacher, minister to God, patriot, benefactor and helper of all souls, he carried his spirit of the Gospel to every corner that he visited, all his life." And ex-President Taft, after referring to Dr. Hale's "irresistible personality," and asking, "Who can forget that fine face, that deep voice, and that loving disposition?" declared that culture, nobility, and other qualities made every man in this country proud that Edward Everett Hale was an American. The same note was struck by Mayor Fitzgerald, who told his audience to seek for Dr. Hale's real monument in the hearts of the poor and oppressed everywhere. The author of "The Man Without a Country" and of "Memories of a Hundred Years" (and it is a constant pleasure for the editors of The Outlook to remember that the latter work first appeared in its pages) has left a wide and lasting memory of kindliness, sweetness, and strength.

Thrift and Foresight Among the Negroes

Dr. Booker Washington is never so happy as when he is recording instances of practical and positive advance among his people in the direction of the thrift and progress which he has so long and so forcefully urged upon them as the immediate duty and hope of the race. Recently Dr. Washington has visited the four counties which are often described as Tidewater Virginia—namely, Northampton, Accomac, Mathews, and Gloucester—and the report he makes to The Outlook of the condition of the thirty-odd thousand happy and prosperous colored people he found there is most encouraging. They produce every year farming crops to the value of six million dollars, and everywhere he saw farms well tilled, modern farming implements and attractive dwellings, while no fewer than fifteen hundred farms are owned by the Negroes themselves. All this was evidently the fruits of application to work, continued and persistent labor, thrift and foresight. From another source comes the significant item of news that while in one of these tidewater counties (Gloucester) there are six thousand white people and six thousand colored people, there was not during the months of April and May a single prisoner of either race in the county jail. In his talk to the crowds of people who met him at various points (and in Gloucester we learn that the Circuit Court and the white high school adjourned in order that the court officers and the teachers and students might listen to Dr. Washington's address) he urged mutual helpfulness, industry, respect for law, and patriotism. He did not fail to point out the shortcomings of his own people, and his solution of the race problem was the improvement of the man on the land through contact with just ideas of education. The Southern white man, he holds, understands the Negro better than any other man on earth, and, conversely, the Negro understands the Southern white man. "There are no difficulties in the South that white men and black men, working together, cannot settle. There is enough of wisdom, patience, Christianity, and common sense in the South to solve all the so-called race problems. White people and black people are going to live in the South for all time."

A Department Store Sale of Municipal Bonds

Through the enterprise of a St. Paul department store—the Golden Rule—the country has seen something new in the way of marketing city bonds. St. Paul had ready and waiting for sale local assessment paving bonds to the amount of $209,000, bearing interest at the rate of six per cent from May 1, June 1, and July 1, 1913, until April 1, 1914. Despite the high rate, it was found difficult to market the bonds, owing to certain legal technicalities. Brokers would not take hold. The city was confronted with a problem. It needed the money, but it couldn't sell its bonds. What was to be done? While the city officials were debating and getting nowhere, one of the large department stores saw in the situation an opportunity to do something novel, attract attention, and at the same time to do its customers a real service. Its heads, therefore, went to the city officials and bought

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such bonds as they could get, a local trust company in the meantime having taken a part of the issue. The department store secured bonds to the amount of $123,000. Thereupon it announced through the local papers that on a certain date it would sell the bonds over its counters at the price paid for them. Furthermore, it agreed to guarantee the bonds, so that in case legal difficulties arose and any of the purchasers wished their money refunded, they could get it for the asking. Interest, also, was to be allowed from the time of sale until interest began to accrue. The bonds were disposed of as fast as the clerks assigned to the duty could take the money and issue the necessary receipts. The average purchase was about $250. The actual time consumed in the entire sale was less than five hours, and scores of people went away disappointed that they had not come in time to obtain a share of the securities. Among the purchasers women were in great majority, though this does not necessarily indicate that they bought for themselves rather than for their husbands or families. The money offered came in part from the postal savings bank, from local savings banks, and from home hoardings. Mr. James J. Hill expressed himself as interested because of the fact that the sale showed clearly that the public could finance their own public improvements, and as a result would take a personal interest in seeing that they were well done. Another of the city's financiers said that "every dollar brought out of hiding by the sale was worth five dollars of credit."

Swivel-Chair Engineers and the Panama Canal

That the topography of the Canal Zone is still an unsolved mystery to many reporters, recent newspaper comment goes far to show. Not long since a well-known daily announced in prominent headlines:

CULEBRA CUT CLOSING IN!

The news item which followed, a discussion of the famous Cucaracha slide that has caused so much trouble to engineers and editors alike, proved beyond a doubt that its author was blissfully ignorant of the size of both slide and cut. Forty-seven acres of moving earth is quite a formidable object, it is true, but hardly big enough to "close in" the sides of an artificial valley that is nine miles long. Despite the ingenuous comment of the press, the Canal is rapidly approaching completion. On May 18 the waters of the Pacific were admitted to part of the Canal prism below the locks at Miraflores. Excavation in this section, previously carried on "in the dry," will now be completed by the great dredges that have been at work in the harbor of Ancon. A reporter, describing the removal of the temporary dam that held back the waters of the Pacific, located that barrier "between the upper locks at Pedro Miguel and the lower locks at Miraflores." Evidently, if such is the case, the waters of the Pacific have much to learn concerning the law of gravitation. Another incident, significant alike of the progress of the Canal and of the Stygian darkness that enshrouds the intelligence of some of our newspaper engineers, occurred on May 24. On that day the final grade was reached throughout the length but not the width of the Culebra Cut. A lyric-hearted reporter on the New York "Times" describes this interesting event as follows: "The whistles blew and hundreds of workmen quit their jobs to cheer when the big engines scooped out the last thread of earth that joined the two continents." If the reporter responsible for that announcement will take the trouble of verifying his statement by a trip to the Isthmus, he will be disappointed to find that the two continents are still precariously bound together by a "thread of earth" some thirty-one miles in width.

LABOR THEORIES AND A LABOR WAR

Ignorance is a cure for nothing. That saying of one of the most useful of American educational leaders applies with a special force to the serious industrial questions of our time, and in particular to such a situation as exists in Paterson, New Jersey. No more serious error can be made than that of refusing to understand that which one dislikes or opposes simply because of the dislike and opposition. However contrary to the spirit of the American people such a movement as that represented by the Industrial Workers of the World may be, however heartily the American people may wish to oppose it and frustrate it, the American people ought to understand it. Even should it be granted that this movement is an enemy of the people, its methods, its purposes, its spirit, should be understood. Whether we regard it as a democratic uprising on behalf of liberty and justice, or as a sinister menace

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not only to property but also to the welfare of all individuals, rich and poor alike, we should welcome a knowledge of the facts concerning it, and of the feelings and ideas of those who are taking part in it. Mr. Mason's account of the conditions at Paterson which appears elsewhere in this issue will, we believe, help to explain that strike and its accessories. Those who will read this piece of special correspondence from Paterson will, we think, realize that that strike, like the strike at Lawrence, Massachusetts, is not an isolated industrial disturbance that concerns only, or even chiefly, the local mill-owners and employees, but is a sign and symptom of a new force that is showing itself in this country as it has shown itself in other lands.

This force is the force of an idea, not to say an ideal. It has some of the characteristics of a religion. Like most if not all great religions, it makes its first and intensest appeal to the lowliest and humblest members of society; it has a vision of what is going to happen some day to demonstrate to all the world its truth and its power; it incites in the hearts of its followers the spirit of bold devotion and uncalculating self-sacrifice, and, though starting without a philosophy, it has now developed a philosophy of its own.

Such is what, for lack of a better term, we must call Syndicalism.

It has not been created out of hand, but has grown like a living organism from a seed which was once a part of another organism. It bears a direct relation to Socialism, but is different from it as Christianity is different from Judaism from which it sprang, or as American civilization is different from English civilization.

The word Syndicalism comes from the French word *syndicat*. The corresponding English word syndicate is used chiefly if not wholly with reference to combinations of capitalists or of properties; the French word *syndicat* is used largely with reference to combinations of labor. Syndicalism is therefore a form of labor-unionism. In France the term is applied to two kinds. One kind is very much like that which is familiar in the United States. It is called reformist Syndicalism, or the Yellows. The other is known as revolutionary Syndicalism, or the Reds. This type is usually meant when the word Syndicalism is used. The leaders of this branch have become altogether disgusted with the conciliatory methods advocated by the Yellows. They say that the labor men who go into legislative or administrative office avowedly for the purpose of improving the conditions of labor and promoting the ideals which they profess become like any other politicians, make compromises with the capitalists, and even go so far as to employ the instruments of government to repress labor agitation and industrial war. So the leaders of the revolutionary form of Syndicalism will have nothing to do with the attempts to form political parties on labor's behalf. They declare that labor is in a critical struggle with capital, and that it is useless for labor to try to attain its ends by roundabout and indirect means; that instead it should confine itself to "direct action."

Under this term are included all kinds of direct dealings between capitalists and labor, but from the point of view of the Syndicalist no dealings on the part of labor are justifiable unless they are hostile. According to the Syndicalist, it is the laborer alone who has a right to the ownership of the means of production; the person who is getting a reward for merely owning the means of production is getting a reward to which he is not entitled; the ownership of all means of production should be in the hands of the workers; until it is transferred from the capitalists to the workers there must be a state of industrial struggle, or, as they call it, industrial war. In this respect the Syndicalist and the Socialist agree. They agree that each wage-earner, therefore, should be conscious of the rights of all laborers as against the pretensions of the capitalists. In other words, the wage-earners should be class-conscious. It is in the methods of carrying on this struggle of the laboring class against the capitalist class that the Syndicalist disagrees with the political Socialist. The political Socialist says that this struggle should be carried on by means of legislation as well as by strikes and the like; while the Syndicalist says it is worse than useless to resort to legislation, for the State itself is capitalistic; that there is, therefore, no other means that is legitimate except that of direct action. So while the political Socialist is building up his party and trying to secure more votes for Socialist candidates, the Syndicalist is busy among the workers, teaching them how to strike most effectively, how to use their weakness and their poverty against the strength and the wealth of their employers. In the mind of the Syndicalist every strike is justifiable, for so long as there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are such beings as employers every employee has a grievance.

Here comes a sharp distinction between the Syndicalist and what we Americans know as the trades-unionist. The ordinary trades union man recognizes the existence of the wages system. What he wants from his employer is a fair day's wage for a fair day's work, proper conditions under which to work, compensation for accidents incurred in the course of his duties, and reasonable certainty of employment. When the trades-unionist strikes, he strikes for the purpose either of securing some such specific advantages as these, or for the purpose of forcing the employer to recognize the union that is formed for the purpose of securing such advantages. The Syndicalist has a very different view. Of course he wants to get all the advantages that he can, but these are all incidental to his steady march on toward a goal which means abolition of the whole capitalistic system. When the trades union orders a strike, it is in order to secure certain specific demands which have been made upon the employer. When the Syndicalist orders a strike, there may be no demands formulated at all. It may be a strike simply to show the strength of the employees, it may be a strike simply to irritate and annoy and harass the employer, or it may be simply a practice strike in rehearsal for some larger strike to come, a strike that might be compared to a fire drill or to army maneuvers.

There is another distinction between the Syndicalist and the ordinary trades-unionist. In this country the trades union is organized along the lines of the craft. For example, the spinners belong to one union, the weavers belong to another, the teamsters belong to still another. Thus, if the spinners strike the rest are unaffected and the employers or managers need simply fill the places of the members of one class. The Syndicalist organization is entirely different. In that all the workers in a single industry are united without regard to craft distinction. Under this form all employees in an industry would be in a single union, and a strike by that union would mean the paralysis of the industry. Instead of the spinners in five different factories belonging to a single union and one that was different from the union of weavers in those factories, the spinners, weavers, and teamsters in each one of the factories would belong to a common union. A single industry could thus be paralyzed.

In a brief statement like this it is impossible to give with any degree of fullness a description of this new form of labor organization. It is possible only to suggest certain of its characteristics. It regards all capitalists as its enemies; the present state of industry as a state of war; a strike as a means of harassing or weakening the enemy; the object of its fight the securing of control for the worker of all the means of production. It does not aim its weapons against the public. It is willing and ready to make the machinery go on strike by leaving the workers at their places, by allowing "accidents" of trifling sorts to happen so that the machinery does not turn out the product it is expected to turn out—a form of *sabotage;* and in other ways secures the effect of the strike without causing the workers to lose the day's work or a day's pay. Syndicalism is thus in its practices, in its purposes, and in its forms of organization radically different from the ordinary trades union. In some respects that is one secret of its strength. It goes to the unskilled workers, to the most poorly paid workers, to the workers who have been unorganized, to the workers whom other labor organizations have not touched, and it says, Here is a gospel for you. The employer is not interested in you, for all he wants is your labor at least expense. The ordinary trades union is not interested in you because you have no money with which to pay dues, and besides you are foreigners, and poor, and unskilled. You do not know your strength. If you could only once all agree to sit still and fold your hands, you would have all capitalists at your feet, and you would come into your own.

The Industrial Workers of the World is the organization, if so loosely bound a body of people can be called an organization, which in America represents Syndicalism.

We do not believe that the methods or practices of the Syndicalists hold out any hope for the wage-earner, or that their purposes can even be remotely achieved; but we do not believe that wholesale and generalized attack on them can take the place of clear understanding of their purposes and their practices. It is also clear to us that so long as there are employers who treat labor as a commodity instead of as human beings, who resist all effort of laborers to organize to secure their own rights, and who regard the industry in which they are engaged as their own private possession and disown any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interest on the part of the employee in the conduct of the business, there will be reason for expecting that such a movement as that of the Industrial Workers of the World will continue. But one wrong does not justify another; and the remedy for industrial injustice is not to be found in private war.

A RABBI'S VIEW OF JESUS

The Outlook agrees with much in the interesting and significant article of Rabbi Wise on another page, on "The Life and Teachings of Jesus the Jew." Jesus was a Jew, and in his teaching he assumed the great truths which the prophets of Judaism had interpreted and which constitute the gift of the Hebrew people to the world. But he was more than a Jew; and his life and teaching did more than supplement the teaching of previous prophets. They both interpreted and fulfilled those teachings.

We agree with Rabbi Wise in his affirmation that "Jesus taught two great truths—the coming Kingdom of Heaven, and that the kingdom of God is within man." We agree also that these two great truths are fundamental both to Judaism and to Christianity.

But we disagee with Dr. Wise's statement that "Jesus was not humanly divine, but divinely human." This antithesis is, in our judgment, a purely rhetorical antithesis which represents no reality. Divinely human and humanly divine are synonyms.

The most fundamental truth which the Hebrew people have contributed to the religious faith of the world is the truth embodied in the sentence, "God made man in his own image." If God has made or is making man in his own likeness, then it is in man we are to look for the likeness of God. If into man God has breathed his own Spirit, then the divine Spirit is in man and in that Spirit we are to find the manifestation of the divine. Paganism looks for God in nature, and is a religion of fear. Hebraism looked for God in humanity, and is a religion first of reverence, then of love. The first message in the first chapter of the first book of the Hebrew Scriptures is that men are not to reverence the sun, the moon, the stars, the mountains, the rivers, the plains, the beasts, the birds, the fishes, which were the objects of reverence in the land of Egypt, from which Israel was called forth; but are to take all these objects of their old-time reverence as made for them and intended to be their servants. The gods of the Egyptians the Israelites were told to make their slaves to do their bidding. They were to look elsewhere for the object of their reverence. The message of the Hebrew prophets was: Like as a shepherd shepherdeth his sheep, like as a king ruleth his subjects, like as a father pitieth his children, like as a mother comforteth her child.

Christianity accepts and reaffirms this fundamental doctrine of Hebraism. Would you find God? Look for him in your own soul. The revelation of God, said one of the great Hebrew prophets, is not in heaven, that thou shouldest say, Who shall go up to heaven and bring it to us? nor beyond the sea, that thou shouldest say, Who shall go over the sea and bring it to us? "but the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it."

The fundamental faith, then, of Judaism and Christianity is in this respect identical: God and man are essentially the same; God is humanly divine and man is divinely human.

But to the affirmation of Judaism. that the supremest manifestation of God is in human life, Christianity adds, The supremest manifestation in human life is in the life of Jesus of Nazareth. It is this twofold fact, that the supremest manifestation of God is the manifestation in human life, and that the supremest manifestation in human life is the manifestation in Jesus of Nazareth, that makes him the Christ. He is the Messiah because he is the one who brings God near to men, makes God understandable to men, makes companionableness with God possible to men, enables us to have fellowship with God. In him God is interpreted to us in the terms of a human experience.

So long as men thought that God and man were opposites, the alternative, Is Jesus God or man? was a significant alternative. When we come to understand the faith common to Judaism and to Christianity, to the Old Testament and to the New Testament, that man is the offspring of God, made in his likeness and possessing his spirit, and therefore it is in man that the image of God is to be found, as the likeness of a father in his child, we come to understand that there is no meaning in the question whether Jesus was God or man, no reality in the rhetorical contrast of humanly divine and divinely human.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LETTERS TO UNKNOWN FRIENDS

St. Paul tells us that "This mortal must put on immortality." May I ask if there is an antithesis to this, and, if so, what this antithesis is? You have stated that "If he [man] lives with righteousness of brain and hand and with love in his life, his whole life is a putting on of immortality." On the other hand, if man lives with unrighteousness of brain and hand and without love in his heart, what is the result? Would it not seem that immortality must be the result of man's deliberate choice and effort? Would you say a contrary choice and effort precludes immortality? If so, does annihilation ensue?

I am not willing to be dogmatic respecting the unknown life which lies beyond the grave. It has been well said that the object of the Bible is to teach us how to live now, not to satisfy our curiosity about life hereafter. But I think there is much both in Scripture and in philosophy to support the doctrine of Conditional Immortality. This doctrine may be briefly stated thus: All life is dependent upon God. As there would be no physical life upon the globe were there no sunshine, so there would be no human life were there no Divine Spirit in whom we live and move and have our being. It is not conceivable that God will keep that life continuing for those who go on forever in sin and consequent degradation. He offers eternal life, that is, his own divine life, to any one who is willing to accept it and live divinely. He who finally refuses this gift of life, he who finally separates himself from God, the Author and Giver of life, will die. He will not be annihilated by an angry God, but he will cease to exist by his own act. He will die because he has separated himself from the source and fountain of life, as the world would cease to bear fruits and flowers if it should wander off into space, away from the life-giving beams of the sun.

Christ formed a church organization and commanded all to obey it, or be anathematized. How shall we know which is the true church?

This is one view of the New Testament teaching. It is held by Catholics, whether Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic, or Anglican Catholic. The other view, held more or less consistently by Protestants, is that Jesus Christ organized no church. He taught certain principles of life, inspired and still inspires in those who love him a certain spirit of life and of love, and leaves them to form their own organizations for the promotion of his kingdom—the kingdom of righteousness, peace, and joy in holiness of spirit upon the earth. This is the view which I hold. My answer to your question, therefore, Which church do you think is the right one? is, There is no one right church. Any organization which is attempting to carry on Christ's work, is inculcating his principles, and is inspired by his spirit, is recognized by him as a part of the Church Universal which is invisible. I was born and brought up in the Congregational Church and have remained in it ever since, partly because it was my birth church, partly because it is congenial to my temperament; but I should probably have remained in any church, or, to speak more accurately, in any branch of the Christian Church, in which I had been born and brought up.

What should be the attitude of the Church toward the theater?

The relation of the Church to the theater cannot be adequately discussed in a paragraph, but a paragraph may serve to bring out the principles to be practically recognized both by the Church and the theater in determining their mutual relationship. Primarily, the mission of the theater is not to preach nor to teach, but to furnish pure, healthful, and at times inspirational recreation. Whenever it represents the Church and the clergy it should represent them, not by caricature nor by eulogy, but by discriminating portraiture and in sympathy with the moral purpose of the Church and of the clergy for bettering the character and conditions of their fellowmen. And the Church and the clergy should neither make indiscriminating attacks upon the theater nor keep silence respecting it, but should discriminate between what is good and what is evil in the theater, and should teach the community to exercise such discrimination exactly as it is taught to discriminate between what is good and what is evil in literature. These two organizations, the Church and the theater, should work together, each recognizing the possible uses to the community of the other, each endeavoring to aid the better element in the other by commending what is good and condemning what is bad. All the newspapers and practically all the magazines recognize the drama as legitimate art, and actors as legitimate artists. Under such conditions it is worse than useless for the Church to attempt to maintain the attitude toward the theater which the early Puritans maintained.

LYMAN ABBOTT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEEDY MOTHER AND THE NEGLECTED CHILD

THE other day in one of our courts a mother was separated from her children. One of the children was a boy seven years old and the other a girl four years old. The mother begged to be allowed to keep them. The little boy threw himself into her arms, sobbing, "Oh, mamma, I can't leave you." But it was of no use. The mother was too poor to care for the children properly. So the law tore them apart.

Men talk a great deal about what they call "the conservation of natural resources." By natural resources they mean lands, waters, forests, and mines. But they may forget that our chief natural resource is the child.

When they do remember it, they say that society—that is, the State—must be economical of the child resource. They think that society is economical when it takes a child from a mother who, through the death, desertion, or misfortune of her husband, is too poor to support her child. The child is put into some State institution. In so doing does the State remember that a Law higher than any of our laws joined the mother to those children?

The mother wants to keep her flock together. The children want to be with the mother. But, in order to earn bread and butter for her children, the poor mother must leave them and go out to work. Result, the break-up of the home.

Now, why should not the home be saved both for the mother and for the children? When private benevolent organizations put this question to themselves they realize that their most important work lies in an endeavor to prevent the breaking up of families. The records of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Public Charities in Washington show that, in many of the cases where application is made for the commitment of children to institutions, the families which should not be broken up are broken up. A recent report of the New York State Board of Charities says: "There is practically every reason to believe that many [broken] family homes should be kept together," and "This is particularly true in the city of New York, where public pauper relief has been long discontinued, and where the private relief-giving agencies admit, practically with one accord, that their present means are inadequate to the task." This is true. The private societies have done what they could. But their resources are insufficient to do enough. Hence the public is taking hold of the problem through the Mothers' Pension laws of eighteen States.

HISTORY OF THE MOVEMENT

The object of a Mothers' Pension law is to prevent worthy children of worthy mothers being sent to State institutions. It would give enough money to the poor mother to save her from going out to work. This money would, therefore, enable her to stay at home and to care for her children.

Every kind person would say that needy mothers and neglected children should have pensions. But all persons are not kind. Fortunately, some of the unkind have clear minds. Many of them have come to feel that being a mother has a value to the State in dollars and cents.

Hence there have been two forces behind the mothers' pensions begun first by private benevolent societies. Probably the strongest single factor in uniting the sentiment for this reform was the White House conference in 1909. At President Roosevelt's invitation, more than two hundred men and women met in Washington and held what was known as "The White House conference on the care of dependent children." The "dependent" children specially considered were by no means alone those who had to be removed from their homes because of the neglect or vice of their parents, or those children who ought to be removed because of their own waywardness. The children specially considered were those of deserving mothers who were without the support of their husbands. The conference agreed that these children should, as a rule, be kept with the mother and not removed to institutions, and that such aid should be given as might be necessary to maintain the homes for the rearing of those children.

Thus, in considering the giving of aid, the worthy mothers and the worthy children, suffering purely because of poverty, were separated from the unworthy mothers and the unworthy children. Views differ as to the proportion of the two classes of worthy and unworthy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

children. For instance, Mr. C. C. Carstens, the Secretary of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, and recently commissioned by the Russell Sage Foundation to study the actual working of pensions to widows with children, declares that the number of children removed from their mothers because of poverty alone is much smaller than is generally supposed. On the other hand, the report of the Massachusetts "Commission on the Support of Dependent Minor Children" shows that, in 754 cases investigated, 426 had been removed from their homes, not because the mother was immoral or the child bad, but from economic causes, chief among which was the fact that the mother was too poor to support the child. "Causes less important were illness of mother and illness of child, but these were often in combination with the purely economic causes."

The word "pension" is not altogether felicitous. A better word might have been "indemnity" or "compensation." But the word "pension" is justified in that the payment of money is like that of the payment made by the State or Nation to soldiers, sailors, or others who have rendered public service. As Mr. Hobhouse, the English writer, says in treating this subject, we cease to regard the public money as a dole; we treat it as a payment for a civic service; and the condition that we are inclined to exact is precisely that the mother should not endeavor to add to it by earning wages, but rather that she should keep her home respectable, and bring up her children in health and happiness. To this Mr. William Hard adds, in an article on the same subject: "I see an independent citizen kept from self-support only by the presence of future citizens at her knees, and requiring, in order that, as she fulfills her instinctive duty to them, she may also fulfill her indirect civic duty to the State—the means of support really for them and only incidentally for herself."

The applicant's eligibility is thus set forth by the Pennsylvania law:

> The trustees shall in no case recommend payment to any widow or abandoned mother until they are thoroughly satisfied that the recipient is worthy in every way, and that, in order to keep her children in her own home, a monthly payment is necessary; but then only upon satisfactory reports from a teacher in the district school, stating that the child or children of the recipient of this fund are attending school, provided that they are of proper age and physically able to do so.

OBJECTIONS AND REJOINDERS

Several objections are urged, not against mothers' pensions as administered by private societies, but against Mothers' Pension laws as administered by the State. What are those objections?

(1) In the first place, it is claimed that many societies having large resources already exist for just such a work.

That is true. But those societies have not yet solved the public problem of the poverty-stricken widow's home. This is seen because there is no lack of children coming before our juvenile courts for certain forms of waywardness or delinquency which do not indicate essential badness in the child, but simply the lack of a mother's hand to prevent the children from roaming the street and falling into bad company. Hence society sends them to various "asylums," "reformatories," or "homes for wayward children," where they are herded in often unhomelike surroundings. Now the mother could provide this care if she were not prevented from giving it because of her poverty and the consequent necessity of going out to earn support for herself and her children. As the private societies have not reached all or most of these neglected children, something more than private help is needed. The work of every relief society demands far larger resources than it has at hand. This work should be supplemented by the State.

(2) A second objection to Mothers' Pension laws is that these societies will become less interested in the fates of the mothers and children who are taken care of by the operation of State laws. This, says Mr. Carstens, has been noticeable in the cases of the hundred pensioned families in Chicago, where the Illinois law is in operation.

But, if the societies become less interested in particular families, there is no lessening of interest in the practical work of the societies. There is still plenty to do. In the States where Mothers' Pension laws are already in operation the societies do not complain of lack of work. They are asking people to give them money just as before. At all events, this particular work of providing needy mothers with pensions should be taken from the shoulders of certain benefactors and placed on the shoulders of all taxpayers.

(3) A third objection is the objection to every form of public relief—its pauperizing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tendency; that is to say, the tendency to make people lazy, foolish, and wasteful.

It doubtless makes lazy folk lazier and reckless folk more improvident. But Mr. Carstens reports that "in a large majority of the families visited, there was no evidence of wanton recklessness, extravagance, or foolishness in the expenditures." Indeed, it is absurd to fear that the average mother will become wasteful just because in her dire need she has been financially assisted to care for her children.

(4) Another objection is found in the additional opportunity opened for wasteful and corrupt administration of public funds for political or private purposes.

But this objection exists in every governmental function in which numbers of men are employed, and holds equally regarding the public support of children in institutions.

(5) A more serious objection is that the investigators so far employed in the one State—Illinois—where the law has been any considerable time in effect have been often incompetent. Mr. Carstens's study showed that in no less than sixty-four out of a hundred Chicago cases investigated by the officers appointed by the court the investigation was inadequate. It is not surprising, then, say the objectors, that the consequent supervision by these investigators—the probation officers in Illinois—of the health, training, and diet of the children and of the family budget is inadequate.

But it is unfair to judge a system by the imperfections of its beginnings.

(6) Another objection is the cost—the slightly higher taxes (one-tenth of a mill in Ohio and South Dakota)—necessary to provide the funds to pay out in pensions.

It is estimated that the cost of the Illinois pensions, exclusive of the cost of administration, will be during the next year not less than two hundred thousand dollars. The cost of administration is of course a serious matter. Thirteen probation officers of the Chicago Juvenile Court are devoting their time to investigating and supervising pension cases. Each officer receives from the county, it is reported, $87.50 a month and each supervisor $100. To this account must also be added so much of the expense of clerks, stenographers, the chief probation officer, the assistant chief probation officer, and the judge, as is proportioned to this part of their work. The county officers and the agents who reinvestigate the cases before they are heard by the judge are also, it is said, paid $100 a month.

But this increased financial burden would be, so it is claimed, at least balanced by the decline in the cost of the children cared for in State institutions because there would be fewer there. Indeed, the public might really be making money by the Mothers' Pension system, if we may believe Judge Pinckney, of the Chicago Juvenile Court. Instancing the case of a widowed mother with six children, he says: "The expense of maintaining this family group of six in institutions is $75 a month. . . . Those children with the mother can be supported at home by a much smaller monthly expenditure." One might add that, even though it might cost less money to bring them up in State institutions, they would not be worth so much when brought up.

(7) Finally, people protest that the operation of Mothers' Pension laws is not a function of juvenile courts. The work of the juvenile court is, as Mr. Carstens says, "so important that it is extremely hazardous to its proper development to add to its judicial functions the function of pensioning and the supervision of pensioners." Yet such a function is assumed by many of the laws.

This is indeed a real objection. Here and there, it is true, a good judge will pay attention to the law. In general, however, only an administrative body is really efficient. The objection to having juvenile courts administer the pensions has now been answered by the most recently passed bills. They provide that the matter shall be handled by the State boards with special agents for local investigation, aided by unpaid local committees skilled in the problems of child relief.

To this practical reason for taking the operation of mothers' pensions away from the courts we may add another—a sentimental, but a genuine, reason. It is thus set forth by Judge Pinckney. He says:

> As Judge of the Juvenile Court, I would naturally be expected to favor the court as an administrative body. I am inclined to favor the administration of this relief rather by a commission or a committee. Courts are man-made tribunals of last resort, where wrongs are remedied and offenders punished. The giving of relief by such to deserving mothers should be removed as far as possible from the idea of wrongs committed.

THE LAWS

State-wide Mothers' Pension laws are now in effect in sixteen States, and laws covering

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

certain cities are in effect in two additional States. The sixteen States are:

California.	New Hampshire.
Colorado.	New Jersey.
Idaho.	Ohio.
Illinois.	Oregon.
Iowa.	Pennsylvania.
Michigan.	South Dakota.
Minnesota.	Utah.
Nebraska.	Washington.

The two States in which laws exist covering certain communities are Missouri and Wisconsin, the Missouri law covering St. Louis and Kansas City and the Wisconsin law covering Milwaukee.

In addition, Mothers' Pension laws exist in Australia (Victoria) and in New Zealand.

As a rule, the laws limit pensions to mothers of children under a certain age, varying from fourteen to eighteen years. In some cases the money may be paid to a person, other than the mother, designated by the court. In all cases there must be an investigation, by the Juvenile Court, or by an agent of a charitable society, or by some State Board or State attorney, or by commissioners directly appointed by the Governor. The period of pensions is in some cases limited to six months, with provisions for extension if necessary. The amount of the pension varies from nine dollars to fifteen dollars a month for one child and lesser sums for each additional child. Penalties for false information are imposed by several States.

What is the conclusion of the whole matter? The one thing important to remember regarding mothers' pensions is this: According to the heretofore common method, a mother unable to support her children has to become a wage-earner, while the State takes her children and employs strangers to bring them up; under the mothers' pension system this mother, instead of strangers, is paid by the State to do the very work she is presumably most fitted to do—bring up her own children. As Professor Hobhouse says: "The mother of young children is doing a better service to the community and one more worthy of pecuniary remuneration when she stays at home and minds her children than when she goes out charing and leaves them to the chances of the street or to the care of a neighbor"—or, we might add, even to a State institution.

INDUSTRIAL WAR IN PATERSON

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENCE

BY GREGORY MASON

FOR fourteen weeks the machinery of nearly three hundred silk mills in Paterson has lain idle, collecting dust and rust, pending the outcome of the struggle between the operators and owners of the machinery; a struggle that for bitterness and obstinacy has rarely been surpassed in American industrial history. The strike has cost Paterson and its textile manufacturers hundreds of thousands of dollars, it has brought to the 25,000 striking mill operatives the direst poverty and in many cases physical injury in encounters with the police or guards hired by the mill-owners; yet to-day, more than three months since this industrial war began, a settlement seems as far distant as ever. The employers say that they will go out of business before they will yield to the demands of the strikers; the latter fervidly declare that they will starve rather than return to the looms defeated.

All attempts to end the strike by arbitration have failed. The offers of the Mayor, the Board of Trade, the ministers of Paterson, and other parties to act as mediators have been rejected in succession. In the meanwhile not only is one-fifth of the silk-producing machinery of the country tied up, but partial paralysis has seized the entire business of the city, which presents the aspect of a community in the throes of a severe financial panic.

To what is due the irreconcilable attitude of the opposing forces in this battle between employer and employed?

Evidently more is at stake in this strike than the demands of the strikers for higher wages and shorter hours would seem to involve.

Explanation of the stubbornness and bitterness of the Paterson strike lies in the fact that it is conducted by the Industrial Workers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the World, popularly known as the I. W. W., an organization which has come to be feared by the employing class all over the country. The I. W. W. programme calls for the taking over of the industries of the country by the workers employed in them. It is Socialism—and more. Socialism plans to bring about public ownership of industry through the exercise of political power; the I. W. W. stands ready to use any means at all to attain its ends—*sabotage*, the general strike, and, if the capitalist class so wills it, open violence. The leaders of this revolutionary order in Paterson make no bones of their intentions. "When we've won this strike and twenty-five per cent increase in wages, we'll strike again for another twenty-five per cent," Sumner Boyd, one of the orators of the movement, said at a strike meeting in Haledon, a Paterson suburb. "If we can teach the workers that they can take from the boss, they'll take and take and take until they have everything," a local leader said to me after declaring that whether this strike is won or lost there will be another within a few months of its conclusion.

Significant are the following excerpts from the I. W. W. preamble:

"The working class and the employing class have nothing in common. . . . Between these two classes a struggle must go on until the workers of the world organize as a class, take possession of the earth and the machinery of production, and abolish the wage system."

Small wonder that the silk manufacturers of Paterson have insisted from the first that they would not deal with the strikers while led by the I. W. W., although they have frequently said they were ready to discuss their employees' grievances with the latter's shop committees if the laborers would first return to work. The mill men admit, however, that they are hard hit by the I. W. W.

"No legitimate business can stand the method of attack of the I. W. W.," the President of the Paterson Silk Manufacturers' Association said to me; "but we'd rather go to the wall at once than yield everything we own to them by degrees."

On the other hand, the I. W. W. is as much loved by the strikers as it is hated and feared by their opponents. More than any other labor organization it understands the needs of the working class, and the means by which it proposes to fulfill them are eagerly adopted by many workingmen and workingwomen whose patience has been exhausted by the apathy of the trade unions and the apparent hopelessness of attaining their ends through political action. The I. W. W. would do away with craft unions and organize all the workers of an industry into one union, with the ultimate object of overthrowing industrial bosses and abolishing the wage system. Its catchwords, "One big union," "One for all and all for one," and "To every man belongs the product of his own labor," appeal to the working class with more force than the slogan of the American Federation of Labor, "A fair day's wages for a fair day's work." One of the most interesting developments of the strike, by the way, has been the attempt of the American Federation of Labor to wean the strikers away from the I. W. W. and settle the dispute through arbitration, the manufacturers having declared their willingness to talk peace with the A. F. of L., as the more conservative labor body is called, if that organization could supplant the I. W. W. in the affections of the strikers. The attempt was a flat failure. A meeting called by the A. F. of L. was stampeded by ten thousand textile workers, who then held a rally of their own and voted eternal allegiance to the I. W. W.

One very potent reason for the small wage-earner's preference for the I. W. W. is that that body has no initiation fee and dues of only thirty cents a month. Many of the unions affiliated with the A. F. of L., however, charge admission fees as high as $25. There has come to be an "aristocracy of labor," composed largely of the higher-paid English-speaking workers, and it is to this element rather than to the masses that the A. F. of L. appeals in Paterson. The unskilled laborers, and practically all of the foreign-speaking element, the latter constituting about forty per cent of the mill population, have cast in their lot with the revolutionary organization.

It has been declared repeatedly by the forces of capital in this struggle that the strike is not a popular one, that it has been worked up by the I. W. W. "agitators" for their own interests, and that the workers have no real grievances. Nothing could be further from the truth. The spirit of revolt had been smoldering for months before that day late in January when the employees of the Doherty Mill, enraged at the installation of the four-loom system, by which each weaver's work was doubled without a cor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

responding increase in wages, left their places and struck. This gave the I. W. W. its opportunity. Twice weavers affiliated with the A. F. of L. had asked that body in vain to take action against the gradually encroaching four-loom system. When Doherty's workers rebelled, Ewald Koettgen and Adolph Lessig, local I. W. W. organizers, fanned into flames the strike sentiment in other mills, and on February 25 a strike throughout the plants manufacturing broad silk was inaugurated. That date, February 25, is called the beginning of the strike. A few days later the war was carried into the ribbon factories, and it was next extended to the dye shops. The workers in both these branches of the trade had long been nursing their grievances, and within two weeks every one of the 293 silk firms in Paterson had felt the hand of the I. W. W. A few hundred weavers held back at first, but as the dyers came out to a man there was soon no dyed silk to be woven, and every one of the 25,000 silk workers was idle.

This strike was not, therefore, worked up out of whole cloth by the I. W. W. What the organization did was to crystallize the strike sentiment of the workers and direct it against the bosses as part of the war to the knife which the I. W. W. has everywhere declared on capitalism. The leaders of the movement are fighting in Paterson more with an eye to the future than from a desire to win their concrete demands from the bosses of the silk city. They say that victory here would lead to I. W. W. outbreaks all through the industrial centers of the East. A defeat in Paterson, however, would be a crushing blow to these Syndicalists of America. I. W. W. locals all over the country have been sending the sinews of war to Paterson. The best speakers of the order, William D. Haywood, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Carlo Tresca, Joseph Ettor, and Patrick Quinlan, have been concentrated on the city. Without their aid the flame of revolt would have been extinguished long ago; their oratory has been the fuel on which it has fed through the lean weeks since the beginning of what has been the nearest approach to a general strike ever seen in America.

The employers realize as keenly as their opponents the significance of this struggle. To them it is a fight for existence. Samuel McCollom, their President, told me that many of the manufacturers had been forced out of business already, and that more failures were expected. "The silk manufacturers of the country are watching our fight and praying for our success," said he, "for they realize that if we are beaten it will be their turn next."

Here, then, is the explanation for the stubbornness of the strike, the reason for the signal failure of all attempts to arbitrate the difficulty. Both sides to the struggle realize that it is a crucial test. To the I. W. W. failure means a severe setback to their programme for the capture of the country's industries; to the manufacturers failure means the granting of conditions which, they declare, would spell ruin, with the prospect of another strike within a few months to make their downfall certain.

There is another factor in the strike not to be overlooked—the Socialist party. The Socialists have aided the strikers with funds, and for a time their speakers addressed strike meetings. A few weeks ago the I. W. W. objected to the party's making political capital of the situation and the Socialist speakers withdrew, although the money contributions have been continued. There is no doubt that the strike has brought the party many votes, and the returns from Passaic County next November may surprise political observers.

In accordance with its usual policy, the I. W. W. made no demands on the manufacturers at first. As Ewald Koettgen expressed it, they "believe in hitting the other fellow before he is ready. When the men are out it's plenty of time to consider demands, and every one has an equal say."

Here are the demands that were drawn up after a delay of several days while the employers were kept on tenterhooks. A minimum wage of twelve dollars a week and sanitary conditions in the dye shops are asked by the dyers' helpers; the abolition of the four-loom system and a twenty-five per cent increase of wages for the broad silk workers; and a return to the 1894 price scale for the ribbon workers, on which they were paid from 18 to 118 per cent more on piece work than they are getting now. There is a general demand for an eight-hour day.

It is generally conceded that the dyers' helpers are asking for nothing more than they deserve. At present this class of help is paid by the hour at a rate which makes it possible to earn $12 in a working week of fifty-five hours. Few men are lucky enough to get a full week's employment, however.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Silk is dyed by the "lot," six or seven hours being required to finish each lot. Except in the larger dye houses, where the work is continuous, the men are dismissed for the day when they have finished one "lot." Consequently all but a fortunate few earn less than $12 a week, and many average only $6 or $7. With the present high cost of living this is a low wage even for unskilled labor.

To understand the grievances of the employees of the broad silk and ribbon factories, which constitute ninety per cent of the silk plants in Paterson, it is necessary to go back nearly twenty years. In the middle nineties a high-speed loom was perfected which could be run by women. Immediately far-sighted capitalists, banking on the fact that women would work for lower wages than men, opened factories in Scranton, Bethlehem, Allentown, Easton, and other Pennsylvania cities and towns where the men were employed in mines, steel plants, railways, or farms, and where there was a large available supply of female labor. Silk manufacturing boomed in Pennsylvania, and to keep in the race for profits Paterson manufacturers were obliged to adopt the tactics of their rivals. Women came into the mills of the Jersey town, and wages dropped. The men faced the alternative of working for women's wages or losing their jobs.

The ingenuity of man is boundless when profits are concerned. Half a century ago each weaver operated a single loom. Later it was found that a man could manage two looms, and more recently the three and four loom systems were adopted in many mills. Successively as these steps were taken people were thrown out of work and the competition of labor became greater. Another drop in wages followed. While this was taking place looms were widened and lengthened, and the double-deck loom was devised. In factories in which the four-loom system is employed a worker to-day controls four looms thirty-six inches wide; that is, he does the work that eight men with eighteen-inch single looms would have accomplished fifty years ago. Mills that are still on the two-loom system have been forced by the laws of economics to cut prices to the standard of their competitors. It should be understood that weavers are piece workers; that is, they are paid so much for every "end" (thread) in the cloth they weave. Why, then, it may be asked, has the increased productivity of the mills due to the "doubling up" of looms not increased the worker's earning capacity?

Almost synchronously with the adoption of high-producing looms a process was perfected by which silk could be weighted or "dynamited," as it is called, with adulterants which added to its volume and gave it a heavy smooth quallty, pleasing to the touch, while shortening the life of the fabric. This weighted silk has come into general use, as it can be sold much more cheaply than the pure material. It runs through the looms faster than the unadulterated article, but as it contains considerably fewer threads of silk, and as the weavers' wages depend on the number of threads woven, it can be seen why wages did not go up when high-speed looms came into the industry with weighted silk.

So much for the worker's side of the question. Wages have fallen as labor has been intensified. What has the manufacturer to say for himself? This:

In the first place, wages are higher in Paterson than in any other silk-making community in the United States. Secondly, the producer here is hampered by a statute limiting him to a fifty-five-hour working week, while his competitors in several other States work from fifty-seven to sixty hours a week. Then women's fashions, in curtailing gowns, have seriously injured business. Competition is keener in the silk industry than in most others, for the reason that New York is the only silk market of any importance in the country. There are many small firms in Paterson doing business in back lots and sending their product to New York every day by hand. Many of these "factories" are operated entirely by the owners and their families. No agreement between the I. W. W. and the large-scale employers would control these free-lance producers, and their number would doubtless increase if the big manufacturers were hampered by short hours and high wages. The principal obstacle in the way of granting these conditions, however, lies in the fact that it would put Paterson at the mercy of competitors in other States where wages are lower and labor laws more lax.

It is apparent, then, that the causes of this industrial conflict are essentially economic. Under the circumstances the strike has been inevitable. On the one hand, competition for jobs, the introduction of female labor and of machinery, of which it has been said that it "is not improved but simply intensified,"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has driven wages down"; on the other hand, the whims of fashion and cutthroat competition have greatly reduced profits. The wonder is that the clash hasn't come sooner.

The most unpleasant feature of Paterson's labor war has been the apparent justice of the claim of the strikers that they have been unfairly treated by the police and city authorities. The county jail has been crowded with strikers sent there on charges of inciting to riot, unlawful assemblage, etc. In many cases the only offense of these prisoners has seemed to be their presence on the picket line or on the platform at strike meetings. The conviction of Patrick Quinlan aroused great indignation among his fellow-workers. Quinlan was convicted of inciting to riot despite the evidence of several witnesses, including a reporter for a newspaper known to be opposed to the I. W. W., that the organizer did not so much as open his mouth at the rally at which the offense was alleged to have occurred. The arrest of Haywood on a charge of unlawful assemblage based on seemingly farcical evidence, his conviction, and subsequent exoneration by Supreme Court Justice Minturn, was another development that kept the excitement of the Industrial Workers at fever heat. The last move to arouse their ire was the closing of Turn and Helvetia Halls, where they had been meeting daily, on the ground that these buildings were "disorderly houses," a charge that would be ridiculous were the issue involved not so vital to them, say the strikers.

It is as unwise as it is unethical to combat the I. W. W. by means the legality of which may be questioned. That is one of the lessons of the Paterson strike. The Industrial Workers of the World thrive on oppression. Despite the effort of municipal and county officers to throw cold water on the Syndicalist organization, its membership has grown in fourteen weeks from 1,500 to 10,500. "Big Bill" Haywood's claim that "there is a red card in the home of every silk worker" is but little exaggerated. So hard is the grip of poverty on the workers that many have remained outside the organization that is conducting their fight simply to save the dues of thirty cents a month. From ten thousand to twenty thousand strikers and sympathizers turn out every week for the Sunday outdoor meetings at Haledon.

Whatever way one's sympathies lean in Paterson, the efficiency with which the I.W.W. has organized its campaign compels admiration. For ten weeks supplies have been dispensed daily to needy strikers, whose numbers have grown from hundreds to thousands. A grocery store, drug store, and restaurant have been opened and arrangements made with a doctor and even a dentist to attend ailing mill hands. The Italians, who outnumber all other races in Paterson, were amalgamated through the domination by the I. W. W. of the Sons of Italy, a benevolent society the constitution of which contained a clause providing for the payment of benefits to members on strike. By this *tour de force* the solidarity of the dyers' helpers was assured, most of them being Sons of Italy.

Conditions in Paterson are the epitome of conditions in other manufacturing centers of the country. The forces at work there are present wherever labor is challenging capital for the fruits of production. That something is wrong in the existing industrial order as illustrated at Paterson no man can doubt. Who can point out where the friction arises and how it can be remedied?

Indiscriminate and unregulated competition both within and among States is certainly one cause of trouble. Both the manufacturers and their opponents in Paterson say that they would welcome a Federal law fixing a standard of wages and hours of labor throughout the silk industry, if the time-worn States' rights bugaboo would not arise to block such a law. Certainly State co-operation in the establishment of uniform labor statutes is needed. The employers themselves can hardly combine to standardize working conditions without running afoul of anti-trust legislation.

Consideration of the problems raised by industrial unionism and syndicalism can be postponed no longer. That it won't do to scoff at militant labor demanding what it considers its rights Paterson has shown. Let those who fear the radicals bestir themselves, for be it remembered that it is their policy to "strike before the other fellow is ready."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE IRON HAND IN MEXICO

BY EDWIN EMERSON

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT OF THE OUTLOOK IN MEXICO

THE recent murder of President Francisco Madero and of his brother, as well as of many of their friends and political associates, by no means aroused the same horror in Mexico as the news of these murders did with us at home and in the civilized countries of Europe. In fact, the horror-stricken comments of the American and foreign press over these deeds have been rather a source of surprise and amusement to the Mexican people. Old Porfirio Diaz's reported remarks of disapprobation, as telegraphed from Egypt to the Mexican press, have been generally smiled at as the expressions either of imbecile senility or of mawkish hypocrisy.

As one Mexican gentleman with whom I discussed this matter expressed it to me: "Don Porfirio has grown so old and has been out of the country and surrounded by foreigners so long that he no longer knows what is good for Mexico. Anyway, his remarks were made only for publication. Could you only speak with him under four eyes and win his confidence you would soon find out that he regrets nothing so much in his whole life as his failure to kill Francisco Madero when he had him under lock and key at San Luis Potosi in 1910."

Other Mexicans, if they do not care to be quite so outspoken, like to fall back on the following argument, which I have had expounded to me by more than half a dozen native gentlemen and ladies of my acquaintance so far:

"What a hypocrisy for your people, above all others, to make such an outcry about the assassination of two or three men! How many of your public men have you not had assassinated? There was Abraham Lincoln and Garfield and William McKinley, not to mention the attempted assassinations of Andrew Jackson, Mr. Seward, and Colonel Roosevelt. Compared to that we have only the perfectly legal executions of Hidalgo, Iturbide, and the usurper Maximilian, and now the well-deserved lynching of the two Maderos and Pino Suarez. How can your people have the face to raise such an outcry about one act of popular vengeance in Mexico when lynching bees in your South and West are a matter of almost daily occurrence?"

It was in vain that I have tried to raise the point that our own assassinations and lynchings in the United States were not approved by the better part of the community, but that, on the contrary, they were universally condemned by all the press and an overwhelming majority of our people. This was received as a lame attempt at apology and another instance merely of Yankee hypocrisy.

Even those in Mexico who believed in the democratic principles of the late Francisco Madero, and who regard his death as a cowardly murder, are very outspoken in their condemnation of his so-called weakness and mistaken clemency in his treatment of his enemies. This is the view held not only by all of the late President Madero's Mexican sympathizers, but by almost all Americans and foreigners residing in Mexico.

I was in Mexico throughout the time of Madero's revolution against Porfirio Diaz, and I well remember the comments of scorn and contempt that arose on all sides when the story of Pascual Orozco's first mutiny at Juarez and of the easy pardon he received from Madero was first published. There was but one judgment of this affair that I ever heard from Mexicans, to wit: "What folly! What weakness! Just as soon as Panchito Madero turned the tables on Orozco and had him in his power, he should have stood him up against the nearest wall and had him shot."

The same judgment was repeated over and over again subsequently in regard to Emiliano Zapata, Madero's friend who turned against him in Morelos, and of Orozco's later revolution in Chihuahua, after both of those rebel chieftains had been suffered to come to the capital and to depart therefrom in peace following their personal interviews with President Madero in the Castle of Chapultepec.

"What could you expect?" exclaimed the Mexicans. "It is putting a premium on mutiny and rebellion. That was not the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

way of Don Porfirio in his prime. When any of his chiefs showed signs of rebellion, he had them hauled out of bed at dead of night and brought to the capital. There they either died a sudden death or they were kept under strict surveillance until their fangs were drawn and all danger of their ever rebelling or plotting again was over."

This was what is known as "the iron hand" in Mexico. The underlying policy behind it was expressed in two famous maxims of ex-President Porfirio Diaz. One was "Pan ó palos," meaning "Bread or blows;" that is, "Let all my subjects take their choice between keeping the peace while earning their bread, or let them be prepared for the worst." The other equally famous maxim was, "Mucha administración y poca política," meaning, "Lots of administration, but next to no politics," a pithy appreciation of the fact that an unruly people, as the Mexicans have ever been, are better off under a strict government than when venting their grievances.

Students of history will recognize that there is nothing new in these two maxims. Long before Porfirio Diaz was a ruler, in the unruly days when he himself was a rebel, the cynical saying about government and politics was got off by Emperor Louis Napoleon in the Corps Législatif of France. The other maxim dates back to the early days of the Roman Empire, and has been attributed in turn to Tiberius, to Augustus, and to Julius Cæsar.

But to the Mexicans, after the weary chaos of the wars of La Reforma and the French Intervention, Porfirio Diaz's firm application of these two antique ideas of government to his problems of the moment was a new experience, and his strict adherence to these two autocratic ideas of government sank deep. It had as salutary effect upon Mexico, in fact, as General Scott's famous instructions to his officers in Vera Cruz, at the outset of his advance into Mexico: "When dealing with Mexicans, only command; never argue."

While conceding the necessity of firmness in dealings with ignorant and unruly people, especially when a large part of them are little more than blanket Indians, the question remains how far mere severity or brutality can be expected to have a good effect, unless the governing purposes underlying such severity are really good and fairly well matured.

There has always been plenty of severity and quick resort to bloodshed in Mexico, but in the calm light of after history how little of this has found justification! Surely no one thinks now that it was really necessary or of advantage to the Spaniards for Cortez to broil the feet of Quatemotzin; nor had the Aztecs before him achieved any lasting good for their country by their revolting fondness for human sacrifices. Augustín Iturbide, during his brief rule as Emperor, shot his political opponents right and left, but all he accomplished by his inhuman methods was the dismemberment of his vast empire, the loss of his throne, and his final execution in strict accordance with the peremptory methods sanctioned by himself.

There never was a time in Mexico when prisoners of war were slaughtered so cruelly and when unruly generals were so commonly court-martialed and shot as under the despotic rule of Santa Ana's dictatorship; yet that ruler was always in hot water, and accomplished nothing for his country but the loss of its northern provinces and its final military humiliation by the despised American people who had thrice spared his life.

In the same way the great clerical party of Mexico, backed as they were by the powerful influence of the State Church and supported by all the fanaticism of an intensely devout and superstitious people, lost their political hold over the Mexican people only when they took to shooting all prominent prisoners and to murdering whole communities suspected of liberalism or of giving shelter to refugee liberals.

Emperor Maximilian's downfall, after his enthusiastic reception and acknowledgment by all the clericals of Mexico, came only when he let himself be persuaded to take up with the old-established Mexican custom of persecuting all his political opponents and of shooting his more prominent prisoners of war. It was under the terms of his own inhuman "Bando negro," the decree by which all prisoners taken while carrying arms were to be sentenced to death and shot within twenty-four hours, that Maximilian himself was put to death on the Hill of Bells at Querétaro.

Yet Maximilian's policy of severity toward his rebellious subjects was cordially approved not only by the Mexican clericals but by all the members of his "cultured" court, and by his comrades in arms from Austria, Belgium, and France, the so-called champions of European civilization in America.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As will be seen from all this, it is one thing in Mexico to be severe, but quite another to be obeyed.

The admirers of ex-President Diaz in Mexico to-day like to attribute his success in ruling their country to his severity, but they forget that his severe measures were followed up by an enlightened policy of encouragement to industry and commerce, by a liberal toleration of old-established customs, and by a patient and conciliatory forbearance toward old companions in arms, who under any other treatment would have become open rebels. It is true that Porfirio Diaz began his rule by ruthless slaughter of revolutionary plotters; but it must also be remembered that he maintained his long rule by giving lucrative posts and a comparatively free hand within their limited sphere to such formidable military rivals as General Ramón Corona in Guadalajara, or General Bernardo Reyes in Monterey. When he allowed himself to be turned against these old comrades in the end, his cause with his people was not helped but injured thereby. The final exile of the late General Reyes, so far from saving the northern provinces to Porfirio Diaz, only served to stimulate and arouse the ultimate rebellion of Madero, which could easily have been quelled had General Reyes been suffered to remain at his post in Monterey. Even had Reyes yielded to his followers so far as to become a Presidential candidate, it would have been better, so General Diaz's old followers now recognize, to have had Reyes for a successor to Diaz than an out-and-out political reformer and rebel like Madero.

At the present moment in Mexico a strong reaction back to General Porfirio Diaz's harshest measures has set in. With the warning example of Madero's despised acts of clemency before their eyes, the present masters of Mexico propose to rule with the clenched fist of their forebears. "Hard blows and no more politics" is all the cry, but little attention seems to be paid to the necessary alternatives of "bread and good administration."

Military men who showed themselves loyal to the late President Madero have been killed and others are being hounded to death, without any regard to the fact that their military honor and oaths of allegiance demanded such loyalty. In several of the States of the Mexican Republic all constitutional guarantees, such as free speech, free press, free gatherings, or the right of habeas corpus, have been declared abolished, while in most others the constitutional guarantees are ignored, and Governors of States, provincial prefects, and mayors are either arrested and dragged to the capital, or, as in the case of many others, are driven into the bush for fear of being assassinated, as several have been.

Whole commands of rural guards, of State volunteers, and of municipal constabulary have been forcibly incorporated into the army or have been summarily disarmed and mustered out, to be thrown upon their own resources without a cent of pay.

In some of the States at present there are neither governors nor legislatures, both having resigned. In others of the States there are military governors but no legislatures. In others there are legislatures with several claimant governors. Other Sates have both legislatures and governors, but not a cent of money. At the capital many of the States are no longer represented in the national Congress because their Maderista senators and delegates have either fled home or are in hiding. When an important legislative question came up for settlement not long ago, it was impossible to get a quorum because a number of Congressmen had unexpectedly got away and were reported to have embarked for Havana. This really should not have made so very much difference, since it is conceded that the all-important question of the succession to the Presidency, after the so-called resignation of the late President Madero, was settled without any pretense at a quorum by a mere handful of zealous Congressmen of the former Opposition who had been hastily summoned to General Felix Diaz's stronghold in the Citadel.

In the first flush of reactionary enthusiasm over the downfall of Madero, several newspapers that had been too outspoken in their hostility to the old Diaz regimen were destroyed and burned by the infuriated soldiery. Since then the editors of many other newspapers have landed in jail, and word has gone forth from the National Palace that no newspaper shall dare to discuss the politics of the day. Foreign correspondents who have ignored this command have been arrested and expelled from the country.

As another effective means toward limiting political discussion, word has gone forth that there shall be but one candidate and one recognized party in the coming Presidential

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elections, to wit, Brigadier-General Felix Diaz, the nephew of Don Porfirio.

His party slogan is "Peace and justice." Not long ago, when I visited him in his intrenched camp some fifteen miles from the capital, I asked him for a precise definition of his understanding of those terms.

"They require no precise definition," said General Diaz. "Peace means peace, and justice means justice."

"But there are so many different interpretations of justice," I ventured to interpose.

"Very well, then, I will explain," said General Diaz. "By peace I mean the complete pacification of the country, especially of the now rebellious States of Coahuila, Durango, and Sonora. These States shall be pacified by all the means and elements of war at our disposal. If the means are not sufficient, or our elements of war give out, I shall create new means and procure new elements, no matter at what cost. By justice I mean that those who have been treated with such rank injustice by the Madero reign, especially the old friends of my uncle, and those who have stood by me in my fighting with Madero, shall have their rights."

What is meant by "pacification" in Mexico may be judged from the following strident appeal to passion, which was published as a leading editorial article the other day in "El Imparcial," the old Government organ of the Diaz régime:

"Years of bloody frenzy appear to us a lesser evil in comparison with the specter of everlasting ignominy raised in our rebellious northern States by those who profane the name of 'reform.'

"We cannot find words sufficiently violent to condemn those who would conceal their crime of sedition behind a political mask. If all the hatreds that mankind has experienced in the long ages of its sorrowful pilgrimages were concentrated into one ecstasy of fury, they would not adequately express our feelings toward the revolutionary doctrines of those who have raised the bloody rag of rebellion in Sonora.

"The people of Sonora ought to be placed beyond the pale of either truth or pity. They ought to be hunted down like the rattlesnake in the bush, like the wolf in his lair, until they be destroyed, until they be annihilated, until their ashes, like a thing accursed, be scattered to the four winds, until times less dangerous to the peace of the Republic permit our laying aside the rough weapons of destruction for the gentle raiment of oblivion.

"Our Republic needs peace, a decorous, lasting peace, in order to correct past errors, in order to establish justice on a more elevated ethical basis. For this reason it is reason to wash out in blood and with patriotic rage the black stain which the rebellion of Sonora has splashed on our doorsteps. Let us therefore fling out to the breeze the battle-crowned flag of Mexico, and let us not lower it until an irresistible whirlwind of punishment, with billows of fury and blood, shall have swept from the face of Sonora the dirty red rag of the revolution."

The Diaz organ in which this was published was the same newspaper, by the way, which, immediately after the murder of President Madero, editorially explained the necessity of his death with arguments taken from Macchiavelli. Lest there be any mistake about this, the editorial writer gave explicit credit to Macchiavelli, at the same time stating that old Macchiavelli was a much-maligned author, whose famous book, "Il Principe," upon closer perusal, would be found full of excellent common-sense thoughts applicable to the present situation in Mexico. Only Anglo-Saxon hypocrisy, the writer added, had brought this good book into disrepute.

It is not to be wondered at, indeed, that Macchiavelli's precepts for the most effective government in the Italian principalities in the days of Cesare Borgia and Pope Alexander the Sixth should find a welcome echo in Mexico at the present day, for, in truth, the conditions there at present are strikingly similar to the conditions that obtained in Italy during the late Middle Ages.

Any strong leader with enough of a following to hold out promises of loot and pillage, like Pascual Orozco, for instance, or Emiliano Zapata, is sure to appeal to popular imagination in Mexico, and, if he can maintain himself in the field, can count on winning his way to official recognition and power. But to do so it is indispensable that he should earn for himself a reputation for firmness and severity—meaning ruthless bloodshed.

Accordingly the new régime in Mexico lost no time, after the success of its *coup d'état* in the capital, in summoning to its councils and to a share in the "pacification" of Mexico those very men who have made so bloody a name for themselves in the States of Chihuahua and Morelos.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The chief reason why complete amnesty and official recognition as leaders was given to these men, so it was frankly stated by the present Minister of Gobernación, when the latest amnesty bill was jammed through the Mexican Congress, was because they could be relied upon to be "firm" in the work of pacification intrusted to them by the Government.

How this "firmness" impresses the insurgents in the field may be judged from the following passages taken from a revolutionary manifesto issued by Inés Salazar, one of the rebel leaders in the north, shortly after the establishment of the newly declared dictatorship:

"When a man suffers the pangs of poverty and hunger, his problem is not solved by killing him, merely because he despairs and complains of having nothing to eat. The thing to do for a wise Government is to take measures that such people may satisfy their hunger and have something to live on. Once this is accomplished such men will of their own accord return to a normal way of life, without further need of violent measures and harsh repression.

"This is what is the matter with our Mexican people. Our people are anxious to till the soil and to improve their personal condition. The obvious solution of their difficulties would be to give them a fair chance to acquire land and to cultivate it. The military leaders who have lately seized the reins of our Government should be men enough to look this truth in the face. The only effective way of pacifying our country does not consist in cruel and bloody repression with a hand of iron. This accomplishes nothing but an endless succession of killings and persecutions, throwing our country into perpetual disorder and revolt caused by the arbitrary withdrawal of all legal guarantees of life, liberty, and property.

"Whenever arbitrary measures and persecutions cease, whenever the iron hand is withdrawn and in its place is extended a warm-hearted hand of brotherhood, fairness, and equity, our people will be quick to recognize the good intentions of those in power and will return of their own accord to their homes, their families, and their daily work. Since you cannot drive people to work, you might as well coax them. Only when this is recognized by those who aim to rule Mexico will our people be brought back to their normal life under conditions of peace and order.

"The interim government of General Huerta has made a terrible mistake by its cynical resort to 'the iron hand' as a likely method of pacification. Our cruel experiences of the last few years have proved clearly that the harsh measures employed against our country folk are not only ineffectual, but that they have made our situation steadily worse. The experience of our own people and of other nations as well has shown, furthermore, that such measures only serve in the end to overthrow the rulers who resort to such cruelty.

"Any government that really aims at the welfare of the people governed by it should be founded on principles of justice and equity. Therefore, on behalf of the men who have left their homes and their families to take up arms against our new Government, I herewith solemnly declare that we will not accept the killing of our brothers, or of our municipal and State officials, or any other method of persecution employed against us, as a sane remedy for our troubles. All we ask for is justice and a fair chance to earn our daily bread. General Huerta's policy of sending soldiers against us, and of killing those who fall into their hands, may serve to disperse us and to keep us away from our homes, but it will never satisfy our needs. Until these are satisfied there will be no peace in Chihuahua."

These words from the rebel camp of the leader who has supplanted Pascual Orozco in Chihuahua help to cast some light on what was meant by Don Ernesto Madero, the late Finance Minister of Mexico, when he said after his expulsion from Mexico that the coming problem for his distracted country was not a military campaign but an agrarian and social reform.

But so far as the present rulers of Mexico are concerned all such words of warning have fallen on deaf ears. Both President Huerta and General Felix Diaz have each taken occasion to declare publicly that the Mexican people are to be brought back under the old rule of "the iron hand." Since this is their declared policy, the only thing that remains to be seen is whether theirs will be a "hand of steel" or only a "cast-iron hand." Will its grasp be dexterous, or will it merely close on the throat of a starving people with a sinister grasp?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JAPAN TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

BY HAMILTON W. MABIE

FIFTH ARTICLE

A VISIT TO PORT ARTHUR

PORT ARTHUR was surrendered to General Nogi on the second day of January, 1905; only eight years have passed since the terrible siege ended, and the shouts of "Woolah! Woolah!" piercing the clouds of smoke shot through with sudden lightning that hid the forts on the surrounding hills were met by the shouts of "Banzai! Banzai!" from the battalions climbing the paths to death and victory. And yet to one who visits the battlefields the struggle seems as old as the Trojan War; its appalling severity, the sweep of the battle line and its horrors, seem to remove it to a remote past. Across the narrow sea the wounds it left are still fresh, the places it made vacant are unfilled; but to those who come from the West it is like the other nightmares of war from which the world long ago awakened.

Never had a great historic siege a more magnificent setting. Gibraltar stands in a wider and softer landscape; but Port Arthur might be the shrine of Hachimon, the God of War. The harbor, hidden from the sea by hills covered with forts, has an entrance so narrow that two ships sunk bow to stern would block the channel; the mountains sweep in a great circle around the horizon, and within this arena lesser hills crowd one upon the other. Nine years ago every summit was a volcano whence death blazed and thundered, and all the horrors of modern war reinforced by science fell with crushing weight on the army of assailants. On a clear spring day, under bright skies, with men at work in the valleys, it is hard to realize the drama that was enacted on this peaceful stage less than a decade ago; but an hour in the military museum, a walk or drive from one battlefield to another in a landscape in which every hill was carried by storm, brings back the clamor of armies and the roar of batteries. To the Japanese Port Arthur stirs the blood as Gettysburg stirs the blood of the American; it was the scene of the most decisive battle in his history, of the most heroic achievement of his people.

To him the sacrifice is so recent that the pain is still poignant; to the American the victory was so significant that the vastness of personal loss and sorrow are hidden by the historic results of the conflict. The aspect of the landscape conveys a sense of the desperate valor and skill which dislodged the Russians from a fortress which they regarded as impregnable. If it had been planned for defense by a military strategist, it could hardly have been made more difficult of capture by an invading army. Every movement of approach for miles around can be seen, and the searchlights from the hills swept the valleys night after night during the siege, and not a man could advance unseen unless he dug his way through the earth. And every way of attack was swept by a merciless fire of artillery. The famous skill of the Russians in fortification, which at Sevastopol kept the allied armies of England and France at bay for nearly a year, had piled fortress above fortress, and intrenched every hill with every kind of modern defensive rampart and weapon. Every kind of cannon swept attacking parties at a distance; machine guns swept their ranks with fearful precision as they drew nearer; and every hillside was undermined and planted with explosives which by the pressure of a foot sent the torn bodies of men flying in the air, and was covered with lines of barbed wire through which deadly currents of electricity took men unaware and felled them as with invisible clubs; while wire entanglements which lacerated in fatal meshes waited for those who stepped into hidden pits.

To the Japanese who stormed those hills one after another during the summer and autumn of 1904 it must have seemed as if nature itself were in alliance with the Russians; for not only were the summits of the hills fiery volcanoes, but, as they climbed, the earth under their feet burst open and death issued from the ground itself.

The military museum shows little of the pageantry of war, but much of its horror. The building itself bears the scars of battle, for two great fissures through the walls mark the track of bombs; while dismantled guns,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

iron shields perforated by bullets, broken swords, torpedoes, shells of every kind and size, stained bayonets, vividly recall charges and countercharges. The deadly instruments of defense and the means of avoiding them are placed side by side; the terrible live wires and the great shears by which they were cut, with bamboo sticks fastened to the handles to make them non-conductors. This work fell to the engineers; but there was so much of it to be done that the infantry were taught how to do it. Imitation entanglements were constructed, and the engineer showed the infantry how to cut the wires, while another group followed and sawed off the stakes. There are the deadly hand-grenades filled with dynamite which were thrown into the trenches as the men advanced, and there are the nets in which they were caught.

The most impressive witness to the desperate and obstinate courage of the besieged and the besiegers is the mass of ruins on the hill where North Fort stood. This fort commanded all its approaches, and the Japanese literally dug their way into it. They tunneled into the hill, blew up an angle of the bastion, and for thirty days fought like madmen in the narrow gallery, which was often piled high with the bodies of the dead. When the Russian sappers descended into the counter-tunnel with which they endeavored to check the Japanese advance, they tied ropes to their ankles and asked their comrades to draw up their bodies after they had been killed! Many readers of The Outlook remember Mr. Kennan's vivid description of the assaults on 203 Meter Hill, the scene of the most awful carnage of the siege, and the final occupation of which by the Japanese compelled the surrender of Port Arthur.

The men on both sides of this historic siege fought with desperate valor, but with this decisive difference: many of the Russian soldiers did not know where, under whom, or for what they were fighting. They simply obeyed orders and went to death like dumb animals. The Japanese soldiers, on the other hand, were like members of a great family defending their homes. They knew their officers; they were often told what they were expected to do and why; they were ready to join any "sure death" expedition; they drank the farewell cup of water on the eve of battle not only willingly but joyfully, for duty has the weight of a mountain, runs a Japanese proverb, and death has the weight of a feather. And they died as if they were under the very eyes of the Emperor. They were told that their lives belonged to their commander, and that, if necessary, he would not hesitate to sacrifice them, and they were eager to offer their lives as a sacrifice to their country. "Our battalion," wrote one commander to another, "is about to make an assault, expecting its own annihilation. I hope that you also will assume the offensive." A note written by a Russian commander and found on a battlefield contained these words: "The Japanese army knows how to march but not how to retreat. Once they begin to attack a position they continue most fiercely and obstinately. . . . A retreat may sometimes be made useful. But the Japanese always continue an attack irrespective of the amount of danger. Probably the Japanese books of tactics make no study at all of retreating!"

This intense patriotism, this joy in death for the Emperor, who is the incarnation of Japan, is a spirit which was evoked but not created by the war fought in Manchuria eight years ago. Whoever fails to take account of it misses the secret of the nation's strength, the inspiration of its achievements. The Russians did not know the tremendous force they unconsciously liberated; that indomitable spirit, backed by scientific education and equipment, will keep Japan secure in spite of its narrow resources and the grave dangers of its position.

There are two monuments to the heroic men who died on the hills about Port Arthur. One commemorates nearly fifteen thousand Russian soldiers; to whose spirits, on the day of dedication, General Nogi read a beautiful address—an incident which probably stands alone in the history of war. The other is a massive memorial lighthouse on Monument Hill, and behind it is a stone shrine under which rest the ashes of twenty-two thousand Japanese soldiers. There groups of Japanese may be seen paying reverence to the spirits of the dead. As they bow before that shrine they are reverencing, not only the spirits of their heroes, but the spirit of their nation.

S. S. Taichu Maru, on the Yellow Sea.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF JESUS THE JEW

BY STEPHEN S. WISE

RABBI OF THE FREE SYNAGOGUE, NEW YORK

No Jewish Rabbi in America, in fact no American preacher of any faith, is more distinctively a leader than Dr. Wise. He is the founder of the Free Synagogue in New York, and every Sunday preaches to a large congregation in Carnegie Hall. He believes thoroughly in the prophetic function, and preaches to the people of his time on the same kind of subjects and with the same sort of earnest conviction that characterized the prophets of ancient Israel. He has been giving a series of addresses to his great Jewish congregation on "The Life, Teachings, and Death of Jesus the Jew," and has evoked by this series a wide interest, which is evidenced by the fact that the congregation on one recent Sunday consisted of two thousand people. The Outlook is glad to present in this article by Dr. Wise the view of a present-day Jewish leader touching Jesus.—THE EDITORS.

IT is a sign of the times that it is possible for a Jewish teacher to speak frankly and forthrightly about the life and teachings of Jesus the Jew, and that, save for a handful of bigots within or without Israel, few will take exception to the honest utterance of a Jew respecting Jesus. Through the centuries it has been almost impossible for a Jew to bring himself calmly and judicially to consider anything connected with the life and teachings of Jesus, whose name had been made one of terror to his people because of the cruelly unjust attitude of Christendom towards Israel for nearly nineteen hundred years. Moreover, the Jew almost scrupled to plumb the depths of his own appreciation of Jesus, lest such appreciation token disloyalty to his deeply wronged people. During the centuries that have passed an ofttimes Christless Christendom has made it impossible for the Jew to look upon Jesus as a Jewish teacher or as a Jewish prophet, for to the Jews he could be little more than the founder of a "Jewish heresy," which resulted in infinite disaster to his own people.

Even if Jesus had not been born unto Israel, even if he had borne no relation to the people of Israel, it becomes of importance for Israel to determine for itself what shall be its relation to the man who has touched the world for nearly two thousand years as has no other single figure in history.

What we think of Jesus we must say, not only because of his position in the world of religion, but because he was a Jew, because Christianity is an offshoot of Judaism. The eternal paradox of the Jew, giver of everything, keeper of little or nothing, once the giver of the gift of Jesus' life and teachings to the world, and now under the need of declaring what is his attitude toward him, who was not only flesh of his flesh but very soul of his soul! Neither Christian protest nor Jewish lamentation can annul the fact that Jesus was a Jew, an Hebrew of the Hebrews.

Surely it is not wholly unfit that Jesus be reclaimed by those who have never unitedly or organizedly denied him, though oft denied by his followers; that Jesus should not so much be *appropriated* by us as *assigned* to the place in Jewish life and Jewish history which is rightfully his own. Jesus was not only *a* Jew but he was *the* Jew, the Jew of Jews, and it is little less than tragic that, with respect to Jesus, the world imagines that his life belongs to Christianity even as his death was due to Israel. That Jesus was a Jew is only half admitted, when not wholly denied; but that Judas was a Jew is always affirmed without doubt or hesitation. Whatever the death of Jesus may have been, we believe that his life was Jewish, and we devoutly affirm that Jewish were his teachings. In that day when history shall be written in the light of truth, the people of Israel will be known not as the Christ-killers, but as the Christ-bearers; not as the God-slayers, but as the God-bringers to the world.

The latest form of the higher anti-Semitism, which at its highest is a very low thing, denies that Jesus was a Semite, holding that Jesus was an Aryan, and perhaps ready to urge in the near future that he was the leader of the social-democratic, anti-Semitic, Aryan political party in the Galilean province of Palestine.

We need not consider in relation to the life of Jesus the Jew certain beliefs and dogmas which have been suffered to become central to the scheme of organized Christianity.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For we know that they would be as remote from the mind of Jesus as they are unacceptable to us, his fellow-Jews, after the lapse of nineteen centuries. We may reclaim Jesus as our own and yet reject the dogmatic teachings of Christianity organized by Paul and later developed and elaborated into the Christian scheme, through the abatement of certain teachings of Jesus, which made Christianity tolerable and even acceptable to the pagan world.

The present emphasis of Israel upon the simple, primal teachings of Jesus rather than upon the creeds or beliefs of Christendom may further the profoundly significant return of Christianity in our time to Jesus. Christendom, as perhaps never before in eighteen hundred years, is crying that it must go back to Jesus. *Ecce homo.* Not only does truth demand that we, his fellow-Jews, further this quest for the teachings of Jesus which are unmistakably his and our own, but we have no right to keep aloof from that movement which seeks to resurrect Jesus the man from the tomb of Christian dogma. When the processes of the resurrection of the body of the teachings of Jesus from the tomb of dogmatic Christianity shall have been completed, we of the House of Israel know that a figure will emerge who is our own, long hidden from us rather than by us.

Some gain and advance there were in the teachings of Jesus over the thentofore recorded teachings of his people, for such gain was not only explicable but inevitable in the religion of Israel. The religion of Israel was never a static quantity, but ever dynamic in its power of unfoldment. The important question, after all, is not whether the teachings of Jesus, fructified and illumined by his personality, *went beyond* that which had gone before, but whether they *grew out of* that which had gone before. His repeated references to the earlier teachings of the law and the prophets clearly showed that he knew out of what rock he was hewn, that he never imagined himself to be other than a progressive continuator of the teachings that had gone before. However much Christianity may subsequently have been Hellenized and Romanized and Paganized—and all these processes had their part in the later development of Christianity—Jesus was not Hellenic, nor Roman, nor Pagan. His life and teachings were as completely and consciously Jewish as the teachings of Isaiah or Amos or even Moses. In reappropriating their elder brother, Jesus, the Jews of to-day are not urging a single step in the direction of Christianity, but rather the acceptance of that from which organized dogmatic Christianity is itself in largest part a departure—namely, the Jewish, thrice-Jewish teachings of Jesus the Jew.

The really significant and abiding thing in the religion of Jesus was not the Sermon on the Mount which he spoke, but the life upon the Mount which he lived. For the Sermon on the Mount was nothing more than a simple, luminous forth-putting of the teachings of his own time in Judea, based in turn upon the earlier teachings of the Hebrew prophets and lawgivers. If we knew the life of other and earlier teachers in Israel, we might indeed find the same perfect concordance between profession and practice, the same entire realization of the ideals of daily living, the same absolute unity in the theory and the practice of life.

Jesus taught two great truths—the coming of the kingdom of heaven and that the kingdom of God is within man, thus emphasizing the two fundamental facts of life: that what is without leaves its deep impress upon life and conditions it, and, on the other hand, that, even after the kingdom of peace and security has come without, still must man seek and find the peace of the kingdom of heaven within his own soul. Thus the two chief teachings of Jesus were the immanence of God and the imminence of the kingdom—God immanent and the kingdom imminent. Yet is it not true in very large part that Christianity in effect denied the one and Christendom in practice thwarted the other? While Jesus taught and lived the immanence of God, Christianity practically denied to man immediacy of access to God the Father, setting up Jesus and Mary, the Church and the Bible, the dogmas and the creeds, between God and man, not as steps or doors leading to God from man, but as walls or barriers dividing God from man. While Christendom has lisped the accents of the teaching—the kingdom of heaven is at hand—it has not done enough to advance, withal oft retarded, the coming of the Messianic reign of justice and righteousness in the world.

We accept Jesus for that which he was, not for that which Christianity has mistakenly sought to make of him—a Jewish teacher, a Jewish leader, a prophet in Israel, clear-visioned, tenderly loving, selfless, Godlike, though not uniquely Godly. More than that we do not believe Jesus to have been, be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause we know that more than that no man can be. Nineteen hundred years after his birth we hold, even as did our fathers centuries and centuries before his birth—even as did Jesus—none is good save the Father, none is God save our Lord. Multitudes of Christians join with us to-day in denying the unique divineness of Jesus, and see, as do we, that Jesus was not humanly divine, but divinely human; not divinity humanized, but a Godward-bent human soul. It is no mean joy and no ignoble pride in us of the House of Israel to recognize, to honor, and to cherish among our brothers—Jesus the Jew.

COMMERCIAL WHEELS WITHIN WHEELS

BY HERBERT G. STOCKWELL

"IF you want money to-day, you have got to go to Wall Street for it!" exclaimed one manufacturer to another, uttering what seems of late to be considered an appropriate, because timely, remark.

Of course, in business as in every other activity where smaller and smaller groupings of men are found in the larger groupings, the tendency to turn more and more to the final group for help in matters beyond the scope of those who appear in the outer groups is noticeable, and it has produced something of the condition complained of.

But if the men of this country should ever allow a condition to develop fully in which the legitimate use by business men of bank funds should be completely under the control of one group of men, it would be pitiable.

Happily such is not now the case. You hear the prediction ordinarily on the tongues of those who repeat as wisdom the foolish remarks of the idle or the bitter invectives of the disappointed.

In the remark quoted above there was nothing but captious grumbling. I know these men, and know that they are now getting all the accommodation they need at their local banks.

COMPLICATED COMMERCIAL MACHINES

No human being has ever existed who was totally impervious to opinion, nor has there yet breathed a man without respect or fear for the attitude of at least one other man—or woman. Agencies over which no human being can exercise direction are constantly at work to preserve the balance between liberty and slavery in business as well as in other realms.

There are wheels within wheels; some working with and others working against the central parts, or even the whole machine. Even within the inner wheel, where the commercial circle seems unapproachable, are opposing influences to be observed upon close scrutiny.

It must be admitted that men with little financial skill turn their problems very readily over to the able. Some men like to lean on others, and there are those on whom it seems natural to lean. At this juncture the master in every community is brought to the front.

How few of us can truthfully declare that we have no masters! How many of us consent to become nonentities, the tools of others, yielding up our individual initiatives to become snug and well-oiled cogs in some machine the movement of which we but slightly understand!

If there is any truth at all in the general impression of financial dependence upon a small group of men, it can be attributed to this leaning tendency.

GETTING ON THE GROUND FLOOR

A member of an important business group in New York told me that he had never purchased stock in any corporation unless he could feel sure that he was included in the inner circle of those who controlled its destiny.

"I learned that when I was a boy," said he. "I was in the office of a broker who was on the inside of all big deals. I watched every movement of my employer like a hawk. When I found him buying, I bought; when he sold, I sold. *I always put my feet in his foot tracks.*"

We all desire to get as close to the center of things as possible, whether the circle be drawn around science, religion, art, or ordinary business; but especially do we enjoy the atmosphere of the men who are directing the performance from behind the scenes, from the wheel within the wheels.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is a pity that our desires are so weak that we can come into the presence of the great, not because of our own domineering force, but because we can be made useful to those who use us.

On some boards of directors there are those who, without seeming to do so, exercise telling influence on their fellow-members; who vote their thoughts because they possess the nerve to do so, and have taken pains to think out what they want.

On many other boards the movements of the wheels may easily be seen.

A bank official, who represents his bank as a director or trustee in many important corporations, told me that on several of the boards of which he was a member it was very obvious that certain interests were represented by a prominent financier, until whose arrival no meeting was concluded. Prior to his appearance at any of the meetings no matter of any importance whatever was discussed. When he appeared and quietly took his seat, a distinct atmosphere of attention came from the other members of the board. He would quietly ask whether any one had anything to offer concerning some stated proposition. Failing to receive any response from the other directors, who were merely waiting to ascertain his ideas, he would pull a memorandum from his pocket and proceed quickly to offer motions or resolutions covering the matters which he wanted to put through, and the meeting was over.

Another friend told me that he knew that there was a "kitchen cabinet," as he expressed it, within a certain large board of directors of which he was a member, but just who belonged to the inner board he could not determine. At each meeting he could feel that the proceedings moved along as by some prearranged plan, but he did not know who operated the machine.

PREVIOUSLY PLANNED ACTION OF BOARDS

I think that business can no doubt be more quickly transacted if all actions are planned by those who know just what to do in advance of the meeting. Instead of idle or useless discussion, the real business of the company might thus be more quickly accomplished.

But is this result good for the men? The tendency of such action is to create wheels within wheels; and I think it is harmful for any man connected with the machine, whether of large or small dimensions, to absorb the idea, consciously or unconsciously, that to succeed in business he must become part of a machine, that his success is tied up in the hope of being useful to the managers of the machine.

Instead of trying to obtain business through the production of serviceable goods for a reasonable price and creating friends who will naturally turn to him because of his individual worth and the usefulness of his product, the coming in contact with the graduated groupings of business men tends to increase the desire to try to obtain the special favor of men of large affairs—to become one of the minor wheels.

Can the result of this condition, colloquially described as "getting next," be other than that of robbing men of their own individuality and initiative?

The plainly and quickly uttered "Yes" or "No" of the independent, fearless proprietor of his own business is stifled when he becomes a part of a machine. In its place we hear the evasive answer to any business question, temporizing the matter until the wishes of the real masters are obtained.

DECLINING TO BE THE CATSPAW

A millionaire many times over offered a young man the opportunity of representing him in certain of his affairs.

"If you are agreeable, I will elect you to a number of boards of directors of corporations in which I am interested. You understand the law, and you also know business pretty well. I believe I can trust you to do what is right by me, and in so doing I will bring you out and make you a rich man."

"Why don't you go on the boards yourself?" was the natural inquiry. Listen to the remarkable answer.

"Oh, I never appear in any of these matters. I do not want my name connected with them. I always have representatives to look after my interests. When the time comes for me to make any special move, no one will know in advance what I intend to do; or after I have done it few will know the source."

Now, the young man knew this financier to be one of the shrewdest engineers in the financial world. In and out of many business histories, through many collapses and rejuvenations of business enterprises, in all of which he had managed to make a great deal of money, he has plowed his way without publicity. Knowing that, if elected to boards as a representative of this financier, he would be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

compelled to vote without regard to his own individual judgment, the young man declined what seemed like a splendid opportunity to have success ready made for him.

How many of us would have had strength to refuse this start on the golden highway? In how many exists the ambition to become independent factors in their own careers?

The ability of the inner groupings of men to control the outer groupings exists partly in their own superior organizing ability, but more than partly in the eager willingness of the many to secure snug berths.

OWN YOUR OWN BUSINESS

Much as I admire the pioneer and commander in huge business affairs, I admire still more the man who, refusing the yoke, persists in driving his own business team.

To him the wheels within wheels are simply parts of the business machine, to be studied and understood as parts of that machine, just as any business man will study and understand any business facts.

But the ambitious man will endeavor to assemble and control a business machine of his own. He is not content to become one of the small wheels of any machine controlled by others. Such a man wants more than anything else to be in business for himself, to meet the world as the head of the business at his command, having no fears and desiring less than anything else to be grafted to some machine, the lever of which is in the hand of another.

Those who, for one reason or another, have not yet arrived at the ownership state, in seeking to fit themselves for the added responsibility, will know that one of the first things to do consists in freeing themselves from undue favors of the commercial grouping of wheels, knowing that unwelcome burdens accompany unearned rewards.

Becoming one of the wheels induces insincerity and cowardice in the individual so "machinizing" himself. It makes necessary the effort to read between the lines many communications which on the surface should be open, frank, clear, and explicit. In a large part of the business correspondence of to-day nothing appears but the most ordinary matters expressed in platitudinous language, which may not at all represent the real transaction. An illustration of this thought is presented in the following incident:

A manufacturer recently made some inquiries of a friend concerning certain routine methods in the office of a large corporation. A telephone message came from the treasurer, who said:

"I shall be very glad to explain fully the matter about which you inquired, if you will come up to my office, but I do not care to put it in writing."

The matter referred to was of very small consequence and could have been withheld from the typewriter only because the treasurer did not dare place on the records of his company anything at all out of the ordinary. Fear that some one might come along at some time, see a copy of his letter, and inquire as to why he did this or that, or thought this or that, causes many a kind-hearted official to write cold-blooded or indifferent letters. If the thing is committed to writing, it is feared that the whirling of the wheels may at some time whisk the paper into the jaws of the ogre and cause trouble.

"BREAKING INTO" NEW YORK

Many salesmen who have tried to obtain orders from large houses find themselves confronted with difficulty in obtaining hearings. An agent representing some coal and iron interests in a distant part of the country tried for years to sell in New York the product of the plants represented by him. He reported to me frequently that he had made no headway. He was becoming discouraged.

One day I saw him again. His whole manner and clothing equipment pictured health and prosperity.

"How is business?" I inquired.

"Fine!" he exclaimed. "I have at last broken in."

He went on to explain that he had now acquired all the business he could attend to, and that with very little effort. He had succeeded in getting in touch with a small group of men who had taken him up.

"I have no cause to complain," said he. "But," he added, "I know that they are using me as a channel by which, without disclosing their hands, punishment is being handed out to certain refractory competitive interests. They have fallen out with a certain combination, and I am getting the benefit of it. I am in close touch with the group that is making me."

To-day he is in use; to-morrow he may not be needed. If young business men, embarking on the business voyage, could see the danger of the personal complication in business too easily obtained, many of them

DRURY COLLEGE LIBRARY
Springfield, Missouri
PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would decline opportunities for too close association with men who can make use of them as wheels in their machines.

A SPY ON A BOARD

In war a spy caught in the enemy's lines is hanged; but in some business circles he is recognized as a part of the machine, and tolerated. On one of the very large corporation boards sits a man who is known to be hostile to the company, but the management say they cannot get rid of him. He is elected through stock ownership of the interests which he represents. You can well imagine that no details of the business possible to omit are discussed at the meetings.

Of course this condition does not prevail generally among corporations; but the exceptions are sufficiently numerous to point to as examples of bad government.

Would you be president of a corporation whose affairs you are afraid to discuss before your board?

There are many men who delight in being called upon to act on the staff of captains of industry. Such men become professional directors, with hands clutching carefully prepared programmes to follow in board meetings. Like machines, they respond to the lever in the hands of the engineer.

LET OTHERS THINK FOR HIM

The average man dislikes to think for himself. Just as most citizens neglect to make personal investigation and form personal conclusions as to the merits of candidates for political office, so in business it is natural for the average man to go along with the current, happy if it leads him into pleasant places.

When disgusted with the position in which such easy-going habits finally land him, the man's vigor has been sapped and he finds it hard to break his chains.

I venture to say that all of the benefits accruing to the man who seeks the byways of business are lost in his struggles on mistaken roads. When we feel uncertain of some of the guide-posts, all are brought in question until we have the true interpretation.

The independent traveler with his own equipment, sticking to straight roads, has to-day better chances for success than the most careful student of other men's whims and favors.

Happily, too, nature's checks and balances in one way or another compensate for the truthful, direct, and energetic methods.

THE SPECTATOR

IT was Old Home Week in Greenwich Village in the middle of New York City, a real Old Home Week with a reminiscent gathering of schoolmates and old inhabitants in the public school, with a parade, and prayer-meetings, and a strawberry festival. And the houses were hung with flags, not only the stars and stripes; there were banners with a golden harp on a green ground, and others showed the darker colors of Italy and Germany—decorations on the homes of friendly immigrants now part of the neighborhood. A rural American Old Home Week in the crowded city of all nations could occur only in Greenwich Village, of whose existence many New Yorkers are unaware, and which long ago the great city enveloped without destroying.

Past the old potter's field which is now Washington Square ran a road known in the latter part of the eighteenth century as Greenwich Lane, the western end of which is the present Greenwich Avenue, now a wide and cheerful business street beginning at the picturesque Jefferson Market and Court House with its tall English towers. Here the Spectator made his starting-point after having decided against the erratic and now dingy Fourth Street, which wanders on, crossing almost everything, until it reaches Thirteenth. For the Spectator knew his Greenwich Village, having a sort of map in his head—or perhaps, more strictly speaking, his heart—of the crooked streets which were laid in the days of the second great yellow fever epidemic in 1822, when the outpouring of twenty thousand people from the city below Fulton Street caused houses to go up in a night. So swiftly were the country lanes and footpaths converted into village streets that no attempt was made to straighten their vagarious ways. From that period date most of the old houses that are still standing. So Greenwich Village remains to-day a quaint maze of irregular streets of unequal lengths, often

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ending and beginning at the little triangular "squares," with their high iron fences that inclose a bit of grass and a few trees. The majority of the trees in these little parks are the Chinese ailanthus, which, at a period when a great many of the native trees suffered from a blight, was gladly welcomed to our shores, subsequently to suffer a violent eclipse of popularity because of its unpleasant odor at certain seasons. A peaceful region in which to walk with ghosts and memories—companions that render one absent-minded—for the automobile is comparatively infrequent, and the irregular streets where they meet and cross create wide spaces, often faced by the triangular white-painted portico of a market; and here and there you catch the tinkle of the horse car.

The Spectator started out with a plan—but who could keep to a plan when taking a reminiscent walk in Greenwich Village! A green glimpse of a square at the end of a street, a quaint entrance around the corner, a basement doorway open upon a sunny, paved court—all these things conspire to draw one aside from the chosen path. Even the Old Home procession, made up of old inhabitants, sailors from the near-by water-front, and exempt firemen—who have their quarters over Jefferson Market, and some of whom ran with hand engines in their day—even these habituated souls strolled informally rather than followed a line of march on their Tuesday night parade (which ended with ice-cream and cake in the basement of St. Luke's Chapel). So the Spectator wandered as fancy beckoned, passing through streets named for dead-and-gone citizens that still have their rows of red brick houses with white doors and brass knobs (and sometimes knockers), houses with dormer windows, fan-lights, fluted columns, wrought-iron newel-posts, and round or oval windows over the basement door, and many of them with fine woodwork and old mahogany doors within.

It was well that the Spectator knew his way, for the names on the street corners were often missing. He passed Bank Street—not now containing the older type of houses, but commemorative in its name of the first great yellow fever epidemic of 1799, which sent all the banks up there for safety—and, farther along, paused at the corner of Bleecker and Barrow, where the house stood in which Tom Paine died. Barrow Street was once called Reason Street in compliment to the author, a name afterwards corrupted into *Raison* (proof, it would seem, that the Irish, whom the Americans once wanted to exclude from Greenwich Village, found their way in, after all). Abingdon Square—strictly speaking, a triangle—named for the Earl of Abingdon, who married Admiral Sir Peter Warren's daughter, was another point of interest to the Spectator; and, farther on, St. Luke's Chapel, a simple, substantial red brick pile, set in pleasant greenness, drew his eye from the present-day squalor of the once pretentious Hudson Street. St. Luke's dates from 1821. That particular day a good-sized Monday wash was hanging in the sunshine over the green grass between the church and the parish house. The Spectator even penetrated as far as old St. John's, built in 1807, and now doomed, it is feared, by the new subway; and, standing there in the dark and narrow street, between the freight station and the church, at what was once the entrance to St. John's Park, he recalled the quaint charity, maintained to this day, known as the Leake Dole of Bread, which was instituted by one John Leake, who made a bequest providing for the gift, every Saturday morning, of sixty-seven loaves of bread to the poor of the parish.

Following Hudson Street, the Spectator came upon Hudson Park, the site of a beloved and vanished landmark. For he remembers when St. John's graveyard was still there, with its crumbling brown gravestones marked with the familiar Dutch and English names of old New York and its old willow trees that cast a delicate tracery of shade upon stones and path. Those who wished to enter had to ring the bell at the arched iron gate, which was then unlocked by a sexton or caretaker to admit the visitor. In 1897 the ground was taken for a so-called park—a vast arid expanse of cement, bare earth, and masonry almost devoid of grass and trees, a creation that would seem to suggest an unnecessarily generous giving out of civic contracts before the hay-making of election!

Frequently on his way the Spectator paused to admire the beautiful wrought-iron work of the remaining railings and newel-posts of the old houses. He found quite a variety of designs—the famous pineapple apex often

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

side by side with the cast-iron imitations of a later period when the neighborhood was less popular. Many of these posts were formed in an open square or cylinder ending in a graceful curving scroll or a small urn with handles. A surprising number of these pineapples, some still perfect, may be found in the older streets—Charlton, Dominick, Vandam, Bedford, even on Hudson, Varick, and squalid Fourth Street, now principally a conglomeration of shops and tenements filled with foreigners chattering in strange tongues. Not infrequently the red brick houses have window boxes filled with red geraniums, which, together with the old white doors and brass knobs, achieve even in that heterogeneous neighborhood an effect of homelike cheer which the brownstone front could never have had. It is to be hoped that, when the vandal Progress decrees that the old houses must be torn down, the beautiful old entrances will be saved, together with the delicate metal tracery of the remaining fanlights. There are, too, houses with half and quarter-moon windows and steep walls of Dutch outline still standing in that lower region of Greenwich Village. In the old days the lower village ended at the foot of Spring Street and the upper village at Christopher. Between both and the city was the long stretch of Lispenard's Meadow. The Italian organization that calls itself the Christopher Columbus Society of America is ensconced in a delightful old house on Charlton Street and seems appreciative of its quarters. And in another street the Spectator passed a pink-cheeked, tow-headed German child standing in the sunshine of an inner court, evidently an inhabitant of the light and not unattractive old house facing it, now a sort of back tenement, once perhaps an outbuilding of the larger house in the front. So here and there one finds the picturesque yet amalgamated foreign suggestion in Greenwich Village; but, alas! in the next block will be the dingy pile of the neatly built but ill-treated modern tenement, an unlovely tower of Babel! The past, the present, and the future elbow each other in Greenwich Village.

And the Spectator fell to dreaming of the days when the fluted columns, the fanlights, and the brass knobs were new; when forms wearing the dress of other days were framed in the dormer windows and serving-maids in large caps looked out of the round or oval windows over the basement gate. Houses of that distinctively American development of architecture are more often found in the Beacon Hill region of Boston than in New York. So for the New Yorker they have perhaps a greater charm of suggestion.

The Old Inhabitant remembers the time when there were no horse cars, and one had to hire a carriage to drive from the Village to the city below Fulton Street. He remembers, too, when there were neither electric lights nor gas lamps nor even kerosene in Greenwich Village; when the lamp-lighter came with the twilight and climbed the posts to light the dim whale-oil lamps. He remembers when not only cows but pigs walked the streets, and when so exotic a zoölogical encounter as a pig-and-dog fight might have been witnessed in the middle of the street. He remembers when, long even before the days of the aqueduct at Bryant Park (now a memory), Greenwich Village had only its village pumps (one stood by Jefferson Market), places for social converse, gossip, and for courting that may have found its further development in Love Lane, which is now Twenty-first Street. The Old Inhabitant remembers when the springless drays of the carters stood all night and over Sunday in front of the carters' houses after the horses had been taken from the shafts and led through the wide gate cut in the wall of the house. And he remembers the Village policeman in his leather helmet, called "Leather-Head" by bad little boys! The policeman carried only a small stick then, and had little need to use it—for that was in the days before dark-skinned aliens with misguided theories of how to succeed in life flocked to our shores. Truly the days when the Irishman seemed an alien to American Greenwich Village lie far behind us! To-day the "foreigner" within our gates is something more alien even than the Italian, Frenchman, or German, and the Irishman is our brother.

In the days before the horse cars jingled through Greenwich Street, stages ran to the City. The fashionable eighteenth-century drive was from New York to rural Greenwich; that was before it was a village. In those days Brannan's Garden, a popular road-house, stood on the edge of Lispenard's Meadow. Down at the end of Christopher Street, near the old State's prison, the foundations of which still exist incorporated in a brewery, stood the Greenwich Hotel, where the stages stopped. In an issue of a paper called "The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Columbian" for September 18, 1811, it was alluringly advertised as follows: "A few gentlemen may be accommodated with board and lodgings at this beautiful and healthy situation a few doors from the State's prison. The Greenwich stage passes from this to Federal Hall five times a day."

There were fine gentlemen in Greenwich Village as late as 1841 living in Depau Row, now vanished. It was there that Alexander Mott gave his famous ball to the Prince de Joinville. In 1840 one of these houses advertised for sale was described as having "a pump of excellent water and two cisterns in the yard." It had, further, "gas fixtures and a marble-walled hallway with marble stairs." Upon the site of this house the Mills Hotel stands.

There are ghosts of all degrees in Greenwich Village, those that lived a life content with simple things and those that lived in pomp and grandeur in the days when Greenwich maintained its rivalry to the aristocratic quarter on the east side of town. It is said there was an Indian village on the site when Hendrik Hudson sailed up the river, and we know that later it was set aside by the Dutch Governor Kiest of Nieuw Amsterdam for the trading center of the Dutch West India Company. It was Admiral Sir Peter Warren, commander of the British fleet that won Louisiana from the French in 1745, who is said to have given Greenwich its name, and he it was who built the first grand house of the neighborhood upon the three hundred acres presented him as reward by the Government. Not far away was Aaron Burr's beautiful home at Richmond Hill which was built by King George's Commissioner in 1760 and was bought by Burr in 1797. On the grounds he constructed an artificial pond known as "Burr's Pond," much enjoyed by the fashionable skaters of the period. He built, too, a beautiful entrance and gate, which he passed when he went to fight his duel with Alexander Hamilton. And it was to the house of a friend in Jane Street, not far away, that the dying Hamilton was carried a few hours later. The Richmond Hill house stood in the middle of what is now Charlton Street, a quiet Greenwich backwater between tenements and business blocks. Afterwards it became a theater, which never prospered, and in 1849 it was torn down. Aaron Burr's beautiful daughter Theodosia, it is recorded, fell a victim to Barataria pirates.

As the Spectator stood dreaming of the past he was roused by the hoot of a hoodlum from a passing truck, and looked up into the face of one of those overgrown "second generation" youths of a type that is neither keen nor wholesome. And as he hesitated choosing his path, a small and very dirty child playing in the gutter flung with the uncertain but vivacious aim of infancy some nameless missile that narrowly escaped his eye. At a window the swarthy face of an untidy woman with wide Slavic cheek-bones stared at him with a frowning curiosity half bovine, half hostile, and he turned, a little sadly, to retrace his steps. The old order changeth and must change, that we all know, yet sometimes we are tenacious of its legends and memories. And it occurred to the Spectator that there was something in the history of our too generously invited alien immigration akin to that of the rise and fall of the Asiatic ailanthus; and he wondered if the generations that were to come could ever become as acclimated and as unobtrusive as the ailanthus.

On the way home the Spectator passed two rows of wooden houses having three stories of vine-covered balcony, one in West Eleventh Street, one on Seventh Avenue in the same neighborhood. Old ladies sat in rocking-chairs reading on the porch, and a responsible dog from the top of the steps complacently commanded a neat stretch of green lawn and shrubbery. And the Spectator reflected that here at least was a bit of life that was not of New York but of Greenwich Village. He chose a homeward turn that led him past the diminutive Patchin Place. There he came upon a small round ball of a cream-colored puppy with no pedigree, tearing at the corner-stone of a little brick house with ferocious milk teeth and fearsomely scratching up earth with fat fore paws. The puppy paused, lifting an earth-ringed rose, and wagged a fat tail, and the Spectator, having acknowledged his greeting, passed on wondering if it were not better to be a puppy with no pedigree in Patchin Place, or a Greenwich Village house-dog commanding a green lawn with shrubs, than an uptown canine of high degree on a leash with a bow on his collar but with no earth to dig in!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW BOOKS

Armaments and Arbitration. By A. T. Mahan, D.C.L., LL.D. Harper & Bros., New York. $1.40.

The most noted writer on military and naval subjects has just published a new book. Like its predecessors, it is a notable volume. It is both interesting and suggestive. First of all, it redefines the function of arbitration. We are told that arbitration should not merely settle the disputes which threaten war. It should also rectify inequalities. Inequalities place nations on different planes of advantage. Hence jealousies are produced that lead to war. While perfection can never be reached, it is something to know that, in the mind of a Mahan, arbitration has a wider meaning than that given to it by men of less limited vision. In the second place, while the author would be the last to deny the value of arbitration in settling certain international disputes, he is foremost in recognizing that regarding other disputes force must be recognized. We have but to think of recent events in China, Persia, Turkey, Tripoli, and Morocco to realize this. As to Panama, this critic's discussion of our Government's action in 1902 upholds the deeds of Theodore Roosevelt and John Hay. The Treaty of 1846, as interpreted by Secretary Seward in 1865 in reply to Colombia's question, guaranteed Colombian sovereignty only as against foreign invasion. The object of the United States in entering into this treaty, as its text shows, was to secure the freedom of isthmian transit. If that were threatened, our right of armed interference was affirmed by Secretary Gresham. Hence, in 1903, when preparations for revolt were being made upon the Isthmus, in reply to the question, Did the Treaty of 1846 bind us not to exercise our right of interference on behalf of our threatened interests? there was a conviction that, the occasion not being one of foreign invasion but of domestic disturbance, the treaty guarantees did not apply. If the treaty did not apply, then the right sanctioning forcible intervention remains. The question became, not one of law, but one of morals. The well-being of the United States, of Panama, of foreign states, of Colombia herself, was indeed one element in deciding whether our course was proper. Colombia's final ejectment from property which she could not improve herself was, we add, precisely in line with actions going on elsewhere: India, Egypt, Persia, Tripoli, Tunis, Algeria, Morocco, all stand on the same general basis as Panama. Another interesting feature of this latest Mahan book is the discussion of the effort to limit the purely legal right of other nations. The case is instanced of Denmark's supposed consideration of a sale of one or more of her West Indian islands to Germany. Denmark had a legal right to do this, and Germany had an equally legal right to buy the property. But when it was suggested that the American Government would disapprove, the project, it is reported, was dropped. This brings up the Monroe Doctrine; and no one can read these pages without being convinced that a nation can hardly make its principles respected without the power of armed force behind those principles. Thus the Monroe Doctrine, declares Admiral Mahan, would be a vain thing were there not physical force to make it respected. A like consideration, he aptly adds, compels Germany to build up such a navy that England will think twice before venturing to provoke its use. The author also pays his compliments to Mr. Norman Angell's "Great Illusion." Mr. Angell's theory of war was founded upon the idea that it is but the outcome of material self-interest; and hence Mr. Angell argued that, as such self-interest does not gain by war, but loses, the motive to war will be attenuated and will ultimately expire with the "illusion" which now fosters it. But this premise, the present volume tells us, is in itself an illusion. We read:

> To regard mankind, in individuals or in states, as so dominated by material self-interest, with the appeal of other motives—ambition, self-respect, resentment or injustice, sympathy with the oppressors, hatred of oppression—as by it overbalanced and inoperative—is not only to misread history but to ignore it. Almost every war of the past half-century contradicts the assertion. Nations will fight for such reasons more readily than for self-interest.

Genetics. By Herbert E. Walker. The Macmillan Company, New York. $1.50.

Professor Walter has written an introduction to the study of heredity in which he has treated "the interminable question" of the inheritance of acquired characters with singular lucidity and invested it with unusual interest for the general reader. It is a popular formula of heredity that "like produces like." But it is also profoundly true that like often produces something apparently unlike—two brown-eyed parents a blue-eyed child, to take a simple example. Variation is as characteristic of heredity as is uniformity. In Professor Walter's phrase, "The most invariable thing in nature is variation." Two paragraphs from his fifth chapter state the question:

> Only those variations which reappear in succeeding generations have to do with heredity. Hence it becomes important to inquire as to what kind of variations actually reappear. Can variations that are not inborn, but which are acquired during the lifetime of the individual, be inherited? Does the experience of the parent become a direct part of the child's heritage, or can the environment of the one enter in any way into the heredity of the other? . . . Can *nurture* as well as *nature* be transmitted?
>
> In answering these questions we are of course concerned solely with *biological inheritance* and not at all with those extra-biological accumulations in the way of arts, literature, tradition, invention, and the like which constitute civilization and which make us the "heirs of the ages."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Such benefits are entailed upon us much in the same way as property is "inherited," but they form no part of the personal biological heritage into which we are now inquiring.

Professor Walter, after an effective presentation of evidence and arguments, decides against the inheritance of acquired characters. But he by no means concludes that therefore the new movement for producing offspring who are "well born"—eugenics—is either futile or ill aimed. The theory which he rejects he does not believe to be essential to the improvement of the race through heredity. He has written a volume which should greatly interest any one who takes the problems of human life at all seriously. It is by no means necessary to accept his conclusions to enjoy and profit by his presentation of the subject.

English Lyric (The). By Felix E. Schelling. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston. $1.50.

It is almost as difficult to give a generally satisfactory definition of lyric poetry as it is to determine the latitude and longitude of a rainbow. Professor Schelling has attempted the task with greater success than falls to the lot of most critics and historians. If he errs, it is on the side of inclusiveness rather than excessive restriction—a fault which will be readily forgiven by the many poetry-lovers who find pleasure in fancies too frail to suggest the white heat of creative passion. In the application of his definition Professor Schelling is open to little criticism. We are inclined to qualify his statement that "Herrick is a lover of all the joyful things of the world . . . fair women, their youth, and the charming details of their beauty—its fragility and imperishable charm." That is the truth, but, unfortunately, not the whole truth. As an offset to this criticism we hasten to call attention to his excellent discussion of Francis Thompson and his telling characterization of Scott's longer poems. "They lift," he says, "more rarely into the higher reaches of poetry than any verse of their merit in the language." Interesting as this volume undoubtedly is, we wish that Professor Schelling had devoted more pages to such comment as that, and less to the minute cataloguing of unimportant poems by unimportant men. He has overcrowded the space at his disposal. A valuable bibliography of the lyric concludes the volume.

Life and Letters of John Paul (The). By Mrs. Reginald De Koven. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. In 2 volumes. $5.

John Paul, later known as John Paul Jones, is the subject of a new biography, and the biographer is a woman—Mrs. Reginald De Koven. Those who have read Mr. Buell's biography will of course compare this with it, for Mrs. De Koven flatly contradicts many of its statements. Readers will also compare the new biography with anything written on the subject, and will, we think, hardly escape the feeling that in this latest publication they have the true John Paul Jones. Of all the characters of the American Revolution he seems the most picturesque. The son of a Scotch gardener, he drifted to America. He drifted to France. He drifted to Russia. He died in 1792. He was a man of curiously mingled strength and weakness, we learn from these pages, as we have not learned before. Aside from getting new light on his personal character, we are interested in getting new light on his ability as a commander. It is a question in the minds of some whether he was a really great naval commander, but few, we believe, withhold from him the praise of being equal to any of his contemporaries as a fighter of single ships. Students of American history and readers whose special enjoyment is biography will alike be grateful to Mrs. De Koven for the very careful study comprised in these two volumes, even though the general reader would willingly dispense with a good many pages in which the biographer attempts to "make good" her points. For the benefit of younger readers, especially of boys, who are apt to be impatient with too much detail of this sort, we would recommend a one-volume edition, in which, however, Mrs. De Koven's vivid and undocumented description of John Paul Jones's actual work with the Ranger in defying the entire British navy, and later with the Bonhomme Richard, should not be materially shortened.

Foundations of a National Drama (The). By Henry Arthur Jones. The George H. Doran Company, New York. $2.50.

These collected lectures and essays upon the present status of English drama form a noteworthy study of that difficult and vital art. Mr. Jones looks longingly upon the position of literary pre-eminence occupied by the drama in France, with hope upon the future of the drama in America, and with very lively concern upon the drama of his native land. He has a keen and discriminating appreciation of the intellectual kinship existing between the two great English-speaking nations, and his criticisms should find a ready audience on both sides of the Atlantic. If his discussion of the dramatic censorship in England seems too local a quarrel to excite the interest of American readers, let us bear in mind that we too have suffered from the virtuous officiousness of certain guardians of public morality—watchdogs who can sleep through the sniggering jests of half a hundred musical comedies, to be aroused to hysterical action at the approach of any serious and frank discussion of the fundamental evils of modern society.

Schleiermacher: A Critical and Historical Study. By W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D. E. P. Dutton & Co., New York. $2.25.

A work of importance is this, from the eminent successor of the late Principal Fairbairn, to all who are interested in theological reconstruction. In a period of religious unrest a century ago not greatly unlike the present, Schleiermacher arose,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

embodying a new spirit, originating a new method, and opening a new era in the history of theology. "The whole course of theology since his day," says Principal Selbie, "may be regarded as at once a comment on and a deduction from his work." In this volume, beginning with a sketch of Schleiermacher's life and time, and concluding with a critical evaluation of his work as the father of modern theology, Dr. Selbie aims to let him speak for himself through quotation and paraphrase. So scanty is English in contrast with German literature on Schleiermacher that the present revival of interest in him, now come to his own, finds this volume a timely help.

Human Slaughter-House (The). Translated from the German of Wilhelm Lamszus by Oakley Williams, with an Introduction by Alfred Noyes. The Frederick A. Stokes Company, New York. 50c.

This is a picture of the horrors of war, in style if not in spirit somewhat hysterical. The sale of it in Germany indicates that there was some need for such a book in that military land. It is not needed in America. There is no spirit of militarism in America, no desire for war which needs to be corrected by a description of its horrors. The dominating opinion in America is that expressed by the late Emperor Frederick of Germany, quoted in the introductory sketch of William Lamszus by Oakley Williams: "I have seen it [war], and I tell you it is man's highest duty to avoid war, if by any means it can be avoided." It is also the dominating opinion in America that there have been times in the past when it could not by any means be avoided, and that the problem of the present is to provide some better method of settling international disputes and establishing justice between the nations than the method of war.

William Lloyd Garrison. By John Jay Chapman. Moffat, Yard & Co., New York. $1.25.

An appreciation of William Lloyd Garrison by a man who would have been a Garrisonian Abolitionist if he had lived in Garrison's time. He does not appreciate, we doubt somewhat whether he understands, the anti-slavery position of that large class of Americans represented by such ministers as Henry Ward Beecher and such statesmen as William H. Seward and Abraham Lincoln, who believed in the eventual abolition of slavery but did not believe in Garrison's doctrine of immediate and unconditional emancipation. Mr. Chapman's estimate of William Lloyd Garrison is not the estimate of The Outlook.

Man or Machine—Which? By Al Priddy. The Pilgrim Press, Boston. 75c.

When men invented machinery to do their work, did they create that which was destined to be their master? This is the question that lies at the bottom of every riot at a factory gate. This is the question that Al Priddy discusses in this little book. That the author knows what this question means to flesh and blood every reader of his narrative "Through the Mill," which was published serially in The Outlook, will unhesitatingly acknowledge.

Evolution of the Country Community (The) By Warren H. Wilson. The Pilgrim Press, Boston. $1.25.

Not long ago The Outlook told of the studies of country communities, with particular reference to country churches, conducted by Dr. Warren H. Wilson. The carefulness, fairness, candor, and clearness evident in the published reports of those studies or surveys would lead one to expect a book by Dr. Wilson on the country community to be a valuable contribution to the literature on country life. Such is this volume. Dr. Wilson, with a great deal of discernment, points out the moral effect on the people in a country community of its change from the pioneer stage to the stage of land farming, from that to exploitation, and from that in turn to husbandry or scientific agriculture. The frontiersman had to be an individualist, and the frontier religion was an individualistic religion. Hence the emotional variability and the regular revivalism characteristic of the church in primitive American communities. With the passing of that stage comes the stage of family life in a homestead, and therefore another phase of religious and social life. If it were only for this illuminating exposition of the relation of moral and religious standards to the changing economic status of the country community, this book would be valuable. It discusses such subjects as the country school, country morality, newcomers in the community, and recreation in the country. This is a book that should be in the library of every country minister, every country teacher, every man or woman who is in any degree a leader in country life.

What Tolstoy Taught. Edited by Bolton Hall. B. W. Huebsch, New York. $1.50.

That strange mixture of literalism and idealism, insight into life and disregard of the facts of life, tolerance and narrowness, which comprised the teachings of Tolstoy is here presented in brief form by one who has for those teachings the admiration of a disciple, though not a wholehearted disciple. Much of the book is in the words of Tolstoy, but most of it—at least of the first part—is in paraphrase. The preface contains a brief letter from Tolstoy indorsing a draft of the first part of the book. The second part is made up wholly of extracts from Tolstoy's writings.

Historical Setting of the Early Gospel Religion and Life. By Thomas C. Hall. Eaton & Mains, New York. 75c.

Holding that intelligent minds must at least try to understand the mighty power that religion has been and is, Dr. Hall marks the line for a fruitful study of it. Surveying it from its earliest to its present manifestations, he exhibits its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

two types of interest—the priestly and the prophetic, the one conservative, the other creative; its inspiration in the past to material mastery of the world; and its three types of development—emotional, intellectual, and pragmatic or practical. Consisting, as it does, in conscious effort to relate human life to the divine life, its forms must change with advancing intelligence, its creedal expressions must be recast with the increase of knowledge, but its ultimate test of value is in its ethical working for the reconstruction of individual and social life. This little book is a masterly specimen of luminous and effective condensation of the essential truths concerning religion.

Edouard Manet. With an Introduction by Louis Hourticq and Notes by Jean Laran and Georges Le Bas. The J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia. $1.

Those critics of art who are as much interested in tentative experiment as they are in finished result should take a certain satisfaction in a book on Manet comprising, as does the present volume, many illustrations from his works with explanatory notes. But an equal value of the volume lies in the introduction by M. Louis Hourticq, the Inspector of Fine Arts at Paris. M. Hourticq's recent lectures in America lend additional interest to his criticism. In the present volume he shows the part that Manet played in the history of modern art in France. Manet tried to "substitute the changing light of day for the artificial manipulated light of the studio." But, instead, he seemed only to accentuate black and white, to suppress the transition of crude shadows, and to efface delicacy and subtlety. Moreover, his craftsmanship was abrupt, not to say brutal. As M. Hourticq says, "the impressionists have succeeded in finding that which Manet sought, but they have painted with the colors of the rainbow . . . a joyous escape from the stony road of austere naturalism."

New International Year Book for the Year 1912 (The). Frank Moore-Colby, M.A., Editor; Allen Leon Churchill, Associate Editor. Dodd, Mead & Co., New York. $5.

This particular volume of a valuable reference work is of special interest because of its comprehensive and impartial treatment of a Presidential campaign which marked a new turn in American political history.

Through Siberia. By Richardson L. Wright and Bassett Digby. McBride, Nast & Co., New York. $2.

In their readable description of Siberia Mr. Wright and Mr. Digby have produced a popular book. The authors describe their experiences vividly, and one gets from a reading of the volume a better notion than he may have had of the real Siberia—an area nearly half as large again as that of the United States. One learns to realize, for instance, that there is a kind of practical socialism going on in Siberian villages. One learns about Siberian agriculture, mines, transportation, education, cost of living. And, finally, one learns to know about that very interesting country which the Russians had hoped to make an appendage of Siberia—Manchuria.

Life and Adventures of Audubon the Naturalist. By Robert Buchanan. With an Introduction by John Burroughs. (Everyman's Library.) E. P. Dutton & Co., New York. 35c.

Letters from an American Farmer. By Hector St. John Crevecœur. (Everyman's Library.) E. P. Dutton & Co., New York. 35c.

It is impossible to note the appearance of all the new volumes in Everyman's Library; the general excellence and convenience of that Library have often been noted in The Outlook. The two works above named are worth calling particular attention to because neither book is commonly known and both are extremely well written. Audubon's life was as full of interest for his time as John Muir's or as John Burroughs's is to-day. Mr. Buchanan's book is condensed and edited from the naturalist's "Diaries" and puts the story into popular and readable form. Audubon's frankness and originality made him a picturesque person, while his passion for nature (and especially for bird life) and his experiences in the woods and wild country are full of exciting and odd happenings. As to the second volume named above, it must not be confused with the American Farmer's Letters written by John Dickinson. These Letters were first published in 1782, and deal not so much with political conditions as with the description of a new country and of provincial manners and customs.

A Handbook of Norse Mythology. By Karl Mortensen. Translated by A. R. Clinton Crowell. The Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York. 75c.

This "Who's Who and Why" among the Norse gods, though occasionally too compact in thought to be easily intelligible, should become a welcome book of reference in many libraries. An example of its one obvious fault is to be found in the summary of Thor's journey to Utgarth. Any one unfamiliar with that legend would find the account almost impossible to comprehend. The volume is illustrated in the conventional fashion.

Princess and Queen of England: Life of Mary II. By Mary F. Sandars. Duffield & Co., New York. $4.

At last Mary of England, the Mary of "William and Mary," is the subject of an exhaustive biography. It is not exhausting, however, for the biographer, Mary F. Sandars, has known how to save her stout volume from that criticism, even though we may wish that the text here and there had been more lively.

Gabrielle and Other Poems. By Martha Gilbert Dickinson Bianchi. Duffield & Co., New York. $1.25.

Many of the poems in this volume are pleasantly written, but it contains no lines of insistent excellence.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BY THE WAY

On the honor roll of stricken cities which have faced their future with unabated courage after disaster Dayton must have a high place. Her flood cost her, it is estimated, $127,000,000. Yet last week it was announced that in three days she had raised among her impoverished citizens the great sum of two million dollars to make another visitation by flood impossible. Every American has a right to hold his head high, in spite of our many municipal shortcomings, while his country produces communities with a civic spirit like Dayton's.

Immigration during the four months ending with April, 1913, shows a decided gain over the corresponding months in 1912—311,535 in 1913, against 208,549 in 1912, an increase of 102,986. As immigrants furnish a pretty good thermometer of prosperity, this ought to be encouraging news to the business world.

Many prominent New York City churches are to maintain services this year all summer. Pastors are not to be deprived of vacations, but special preachers are to be heard, with attractive musical services, in an attempt to increase the attendance, which last season is reported to have been lighter, in some churches which remained open, than for several preceding summers.

Mme. Melba, who, it will be remembered, pays a tribute to her native city, Melbourne, Australia, in her stage name, recently sang in London, after a long absence, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of her début in that city. A great welcome was accorded her, and, best of all, the critics declare her vocal powers to be undiminished.

Borough President McAneny, of New York City, urges the establishment of municipal ice plants in the power houses belonging to the city, the ice to be sold at cost in the fifty-five milk stations run by the municipality.

Being an emperor isn't all fun by any means. During his recent visit to Berlin the Czar "remained in seclusion within the shelter of the palace walls throughout the day," for fear of the bomb-throwers. The Kaiser, on the other hand, who isn't afraid of bombs, was "forced to change his uniform thrice in less than three hours as a compliment to his visitors." The simple life has its alleviations.

Chicago is to have a new $50,000,000 union railway station. The great cities of the world seem to be vying with one another as to which shall have the finest terminals. In one age it is castles, in another cathedrals, and now it seems to be railway stations and sky-scrapers that tax the architects' skill.

Dr. Carl L. Alsberg, the successor of Dr. Wiley as the Government's pure food expert, defends the oyster's good name as an article of food. He says that milk and water are far more dangerous as typhoid carriers than the "innocent and silent oyster." Whatever danger there is in the use of oysters is when they are eaten raw. Even then there would be no danger if all oysters were taken from untainted waters.

Why do people keep bichloride of mercury tablets around the house, where they may be mistaken for headache tablets? The whole country was interested in the fight for life made by a young Macon (Georgia) banker who was a recent victim of this kind of housekeeping. The pity of it is that, according to a physician's statement, the swallowing of the white of an egg as an antidote, followed by a teaspoonful of mustard in a glass of tepid water as an emetic, might have saved the man's life if this simple remedy had been promptly administered.

In a new building to be erected by the Franklin Institute of Philadelphia the original Keely motor is to have a place. Perhaps no other mechanical fraud ever deceived so many people. For twenty-five years Keely maintained the validity of his "discovery," inventing also a perplexing lingo of pseudo-scientific terms to aid in his deceit. He started his motor, apparently, by playing a violin or a mouth-organ, and immediately tremendous power was developed. Hollow wires really conveyed this power from a hydraulic machine in the cellar of his house.

Montreal, Canada, is making great improvements in her water-front. A writer in "Travel" goes so far as to say that she "has come within the past year to be the most efficient port in the world, and among twelve or fourteen of the greatest."

In London during July and August, says the "Dramatic Mirror," Caruso will be singing regularly at Covent Garden, and in June Mary Garden will sing at the Opéra in Paris—while opera in America closed long ago for the season. Most large American cities, says the "Mirror," are artistic ciphers during the summer. Some of the smaller cities, however, it notes with satisfaction, have lately developed a strong interest in the classics and the "regular" drama during the summer months, as presented by stock companies.

James A. Farrell, President of the United States Steel Corporation, who went to work in a steel mill at the age of fifteen, has never, according to his own statement, learned to relax. "There are a lot of people," he says, "who think that we just sit around and fill executive chairs. I have been at it for thirty-five years and I am still putting in my fourteen hours of work a day." Wouldn't it be a humane thing for the Steel Corporation to introduce the eight-hour system, and begin with its overworked President?

A friend calls our attention to a slip made by the Spectator in The Outlook of April 12 in speaking of Helen Keller's "first address before a New York City audience." Her first public address was, our informant points out, made in Philadelphia in 1896, while she addressed a New York audience in 1907. The Spectator in his statement doubtless followed the advertisements of the lecture, which announced it as Miss Keller's "first New York lecture."

Another friendly critic asks us not to use the "double possessive," as in the phrase "a friend of Mr. Watson's." We respectfully refer our critic to page 2372 of the Standard Dictionary, with its statement that "literary usage has long accepted" this "double possessive." An illustration of the advantage of this construction may be added: "A statue of Thorwaldsen" means an image *of* the sculptor; "a statue of Thorwaldsen's" means a work *by* that master.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED